377.82
C 286

CATHOLIC EDUCATION.

REPORT

OF

A MEETING OF THE CLERGY

OF

DUBLIN,

HELD AT MARLBOROUGH-STREET,

18TH DECEMBER, 1867.

DUBLIN:
JAMES DUFFY, 15, WELLINGTON-QUAY;
LONDON: 22, PATERNOSTER-ROW.
1868.

PRICE ONE SHILLING.

CATHOLIC EDUCATION.

REPORT

OF

A MEETING OF THE CLERGY

OF

DUBLIN,

HELD AT MARLBOROUGH-STREET,

18TH DECEMBER, 1867.

DUBLIN:
JAMES DUFFY, 15, WELLINGTON-QUAY;
LONDON: 22, PATERNOSTER-ROW.
1868.

DUBLIN:
Printed by J. M. O'Toole and Son
6 AND 7, GT. BRUNSWICK-ST

377.82
C 286

8 MAR 28 Can

INDEX.

His Eminence's discourse :—The Clergy obliged to watch over the education of youth, p. 1 ; dangerous systems of education in several countries, 2 ; efforts, in past times, to introduce Protestantism into Ireland by means of education, 3, 4 ; nothing done, as yet, in a contrary sense, 4, 5 ; what Catholics want—(*a*) a religious education free from State control, 5, 6 ; Edmund Burke's testimony, if Catholics be seduced from Catholicity they become infidels, 5 ; (*b*) a Catholic University—guilt of Catholic parents who send their children to Protestant Universities—English Bishops, 7 ; letter to them from Rome, 8 ; (*c*) intermediate education, 8, 9 ; (*d*) primary education—Guizot, 10 ; Model Schools—Dr. Whately on national education, 11 ; English Royal Commission, 12 ; denominational education adapted to Ireland, 13 ; statistics of schools, 14 ; useless efforts to introduce Mixed System—great expenditure, 14, 15 ; Mixed System abolished in Prussia—Austria and France grant Denominational Schools to Protestants, 16 ; judgment of a Frenchman on things in Ireland, 16.

Resolution 1.—"That education, to be a source of blessings, must be animated and controlled by religion ; separated from religion, it is productive of innumerable evils to individuals and society."

V. R. Dean O'Connell proposed this Resolution :—It is based on reason and experience, p. 17 ; it is the duty of the Clergy to watch over education, and to keep alive, in the hearts of the poor, religion and devotion, 17 ; the National School should perpetuate the lessons of piety taught in the family school, 18 ; the present system wholly inadequate to attain this end, 18.

V. R. J. Curtis, S.J.—True education necessarily includes religion, p. 18, 19 ; the Epicureans alone held the contrary opinion, 19, 20 ; words of Milton, &c.—the Duke of Wellington, 20 ; what is education, 21 ; illustrated by

the effects of training in the inferior animals, 21; results of education in pagan nations—example of the dyer, 22; the human soul takes its mould from education, 23; fruits of religious education, 24, 25; evils of godless education, 25, 26; three systems, and their respective claims, 26-28.

2.—"That we protest against every effort of the State to force upon Catholics any system of education restrictive of the authority of the Church, or inimical to the interests of Catholic parents, whose right and duty it is to impart a religious education to their children."

V. R. Monsignor FORDE, V.G., proposed this Resolution:—Its subject ably discussed in Letter of the Irish Bishops to Right Hon. Mr. Cardwell, and in the *Irish Ecclesiastical Record*, p. 28, 29; right and duty of parents to educate their children, 30; it belongs to the Church, and not to the State, to supervise education, 30, 31; example of the skilful architect, 31; a statesman, as such, has no special aptitute for cultivating the intellect, or training the will, 32; in what way the training of youth should harmonize with the views of the State, 32, 33; power of education for evil as for good, 34; the principles even of the so-called modern progress justify the Church in her demands, 34, 35.

V. R. Archdeacon DUNNE.—Our Catholic claims rest on the principle of authority, p. 35, 36; efficacy of the Church's influence, 37; the Church guards the parental rights, 37, 38; evil effects of non-Catholic education, 38; Catholic education produces the happiest results, 39.

3.—"That, asserting the right of Catholics to educational equality with their Protestant fellow-countrymen, we protest against the monopoly of higher education enjoyed by existing Universities, the Royal and Endowed Schools, and other such institutions, so long and so unjustly maintained to perpetuate Protestant ascendency in this country."

V. R. Monsignor WOODLOCK proposed this Resolution:—Right of Catholics to educational equality with Protestants, p. 39, 40; preamble of the Act of Emancipation, 40; inconsistency of Protestants in rejecting the Catholic claims, 41; are Catholics a priest-ridden people? 41, 42; Protestant monopoly of higher education in Ireland—Trinity College, 42; The Queen's Colleges and Queen's University, 43; opinion of a Fellow of Trinity College as to the justice of Catholic claims, 43, 44; the *Royal College of Science*, 44, 45; all classes of Catholics interested in the question of education, 45.

V. R. Monsignor MORAN.—Anomaly of Protestant schools being

considered National Institutions, p. 45, 46; destruction of educational establishments at the commencement of the Reformation, 46; Trinity College enriched with religious spoils, 46; why a University was granted to Ireland, 46, 47; hostility of the Elizabethan University to the Catholic Church, 47, 48; how the Catholic Church was avenged, 48; endowments of Trinity College, 48, 49; the Erasmus Smith endowments, 49, 50; aim and results of the teaching of Trinity College, 50, 51; warning to Catholics, 50, 51; the Charter Schools, 51, 52; are Catholics indifferent to learning? 53; their success abroad, 53; their efforts during the period of persecution, 53, 54; and in the ages of faith, 54, 55; why Catholics demand Catholic education, 55; and reject the present State Educational Establishments, 55, 56.

4.—"That the mixed system of education on which the Queen's Colleges and existing model and training schools are founded, excluding, as it does, Catholic practices and the full teaching of Catholic truth, and repeatedly condemned by the Holy See and by our bishops, is a prolific source of religious indifferentism and practical infidelity."

V. R. T. Burke, O.P., proposed this Resolution:—Three great mistakes of the Government in their educational schemes, p. 56; Catholic demands dictated by conscience, 57; what is *mixed education*, 56; it turns God out of the school and is repugnant to the true idea of education, 57, 58; religion alone can train the soul of the child, 59; mixed education leads to indifferentism and practical infidelity, 59, 60; what is education based on our *common Christianity*, 60; mixed education condemned by the Holy See, 60, 61.

5.—"That the present educational disadvantages of Catholics are the result of a period of confiscations and penal legislation, endured for conscience sake; and as it is unreasonable to expect that, thus despoiled in past times of their property, both public and personal, they can meet all necessary educational demands, we call on the Government to aid our educational institutions from the public exchequer, so long as hostile educational and religious institutions are maintained in the possession of endowments conferred upon them by the State, and derived for the most part from Catholic property."

V. R. Monsignor M'Cabe, V.G., proposed this Resolution:—Irish disaffection, p. 61; Ireland at all times famed for its loyalty, 61, 62; systems of education hitherto devised by the Government, 62; conditions under which Irish Catholics are prepared to forgive and forget the past, 63; our schools ruthlessly destroyed in past ages, 63, 64; old seats

of sanctity and learning destroyed in Dublin, 64, 65 ; the new systems were anti-national and anti-Catholic, 66 ; the *Hibernian* School, 26 ; education interdicted to Catholics, 67 ; how the past has been atoned for, 67 ; the spider's parlour, 67, 68 ; Catholics do not wish to retaliate, they only ask for equality, 68, 69.

V. R. Canon FARRELL, P.P. :—The partiality shown to Protestants is a scandalous injustice and a source of discontent, p. 69 ; provision made for Protestants and Dissenters, 67, 70 ; course pursued by the Government in Ireland contrary to that adopted in England, Scotland, and India, 69 ; justice of Catholic demands, 71 ; admitted grievances not redressed, 72 ; Lord Stanley granted free education to the Hindoos, 72.

6.—"That as it is most important that children should be trained from their infancy in the knowledge and practice of their religion, and as this cannot be adequately done in schools conducted on the mixed principle, we call upon the Government to introduce the denominational system into all primary schools ; and we make this demand the more readily as a vast number of such schools are virtually unmixed."

V. R. J. DIXON, C.M., proposed this Resolution :—It is the right and duty of Catholic pastors to watch over the education of Catholic youth, p. 72, 73 ; they cannot renounce this right and duty, 72, 73 ; the mixed principle specially unsuited for primary and infant education, 72, 73 ; the ivy-tree of Jonas—Dr. Whately and the Model School, 73, 74 ; the Mixed System the overthrow of the National System, 74, 75 ; no system based on the mixed principle should be called National, 75.

V. R. G. MOLLOY, D.D. :—The Mixed System at variance with sound Catholic principles, p. 75, 76 ; it proscribes religion, and banishes God from the school-room, 76 ; our common Christianity and the hopes of Dr. Whately, 77 ; difference between training and education, 77 ; religion not to be hammered into the mind, 77, 78 ; the Mixed System and History, 78 ; the same system applied to Literature, &c., 79 ; the Catholic argument in a nut-shell 80.

V. R. Archdeacon REDMOND proposed :—That a petition embodying the preceding Resolutions be presented to Parliament, p. 80 ; interests of the highest order involved in education, 80 ; education without religion productive of the greatest evils, 81 ; the scope of education not limited to this world, 82 ; testimony of Lord Byron, 82 ; the mission of the Catholic Church, 82.

THE PETITION to Parliament, p. 83, 84.

APPENDIX I.—Letter of the Irish Bishops to the Right Hon. E. Cardwell, M.P., Chief Secretary for Ireland, 18th March, 1860, 85-114.

1. Three principles regarding education admitted by Government, p. 85.
2. First principle—paramount importance of religious training, 85.
3. Opinions of British Statesmen on the necessity and character of religious training, 86.
4. Catholic doctrine on the importance of a religious education, and what it implies, 87.
5. The paramount importance of religious education not admitted by the National Board, 88.
6. Continual religious training necessary for the class of children attending National Schools, 89.
7. Religious instruction rendered inefficacious in National Schools by being made the mere task of an hour, 89.
8. Patrons allowed by the Board to exclude all religious instruction from National Schools, 90.
9. Second principle admitted by Government—separate religious education, 90.
10. Secular education requires to be associated with religion, 90.
11. The principle of separate religious instruction not adhered to by the Board, 90.
12. Combined religious instruction attempted in the National School books, 91.
13. National School books regarding history, morality, and religion, compiled by Protestants for Catholic use, 92.
14. Published analysis of National School books admits that they contain combined religious instruction, 92.
15. Extracts from Parliamentary Reports, showing the dangers arising from combined religious instruction in the National School books, 93.
16. Third principle of Government—the right of the Heads of each Church in regard to religious instruction, 94.
17. Explanation of Catholic doctrine on the right of giving religious instruction, 94.
18. Right of Catholic Bishops to exclude anti-Catholic books and teachers from schools, 95.
19. Catholic doctrine not contrary to the independence of the laity, 95.
20. Rights of Catholic Bishops recognized in England, 96.
21. The rights of the Heads of the Catholic Church in Ireland ignored by the Board, 96.
22. Catholic pastors told to treat with the Board through their flocks—this proposal examined, 96.
23. No single case can be alleged in which Catholic Episcopal authority is recognized by the National Board, 97.
24. Principles laid down by Lord Derby for the management of the National System, 98.
25. Right assumed by National Board to change the essential principles of the System, 98.
26. According to Lord Derby's Letter, the National System should afford separate religious education, and exclude all danger of proselytism, 99.
27. Essential change in the original constitution of the Board regarding religious instruction, 99.
28. Evil results and dangers arising from the change in the original constitution of the System, 100.

29. Plan adopted by the Board to prevent these evil results, a mockery and a delusion, p. 101.
30. The character of National School books in opposition to the original constitution of National System, 101.
31. Model and Training Schools, contrary to the original constitution of the National System, calculated to throw the education of the people into hands of Government, 101.
32. Training and other Schools objectionable, as assuming character of Mixed Boarding Schools, 102.
33. Model Schools not managed with a due regard to Catholic interests, 102.
34. Various other changes in the National System detrimental to Catholics, 104.
35. Objections against the Separate System, 104.
36. The Separate System does not promote discord or bad feelings. Such feelings among pupils, or indifferentism to religion, the result of the Mixed System, 105.
37. Mixed System excites jealousy among the pastors of various religious denominations.—Violence of Protestant press and pulpit, 105,
38. Catholic teaching tends to promote charity and good will, 106.
39. Results of mixed education in various parts of Ireland, and in our times.—Separate System introduced into England, 106.
40. The Separate System does not prevent the growth of knowledge, 107.
41. The Separate System not opposed to the proper management of the public funds, 108.
42. Government interference in education ought to be merely financial and inspectional, 109.
43. Statements favourable to the National System.—Grants made to Catholics, 109.
44. Grants made to proselytizing schools not mentioned by Government, 110.
45. Many Schools called National are Catholic parochial schools, 110.
46. Reason why Catholic schools and masters receive a large amount of public grant, 110.
47. Disadvantages of Catholic schools under National Board, 110.
48. Government Statistics of National Schools show the facility of introducing Separate System in Ireland, 111.
49. Separate System established in England, though rendered difficult by the varieties of sects, 111.
50. The rejection of the claims of Protestants to special grants for education, no reason why Catholic claims should be rejected.—Privileges of Protestant Clergy in past times, 112.
51. Advantages of Protestant Clergy under present System, 113.
52. Protestant Clergy desire to establish a right to give Protestant instruction to Catholic children, 113.
53. Catholic demands for separate education just and reasonable, 113.

APPENDIX II.—Resolutions of the Irish Bishops, adopted at their General Meeting in October, 1867, p. 115-119.

ERRATA.

Page 2, line 35, instead of *from the*, read *under the sanction of dignitaries of the establishment and*

CATHOLIC EDUCATION.

On Wednesday, the 18th of December, 1867, a Meeting of the Secular and Regular Catholic Clergy of Dublin, convened by His Eminence the Cardinal Archbishop, was held in St. Kevin's Chapel, Marlborough-street, for the purpose of considering the subject of Education. The Very Reverend the Vicars-General, the Dean, Archdeacons, and Members of the Chapter, the Superiors of the various Religious Orders, and a large number of the Parochial and Regular Clergy of Dublin, and of other dioceses, took part in the deliberations of this important assembly.

His Eminence opened the proceedings with the following address :—

Called by God to be the pastors of his people, to provide his children with spiritual food, and to preserve them from poisonous and dangerous pastures, no one can be surprised, Reverend Brethren, that we should come together to consult on the best means of providing for the education of the rising generations, and discharging the other duties which, as ministers of the true Church, we are obliged to perform. The circumstances of the times we live in render it more imperative than ever fully to understand our obligations in regard to the lambs of the fold, and to be most active and zealous in fulfilling them. A great deal is now said and written about the instruction of youth; the enlightenment and progress of our days are the continual boast of the political economist and the statesman; and with the view or under the pretext of increasing present advantages and encouraging the growth of knowledge, new plans and systems of education are continually urged upon the public for adoption.

Every one knows that many of these projects are dangerous or pernicious, and seem principally to be devised for the purpose of destroying the influence of the holy Catholic Church, and making public instruction a state engine for the propagation of error and the suppression of truth. Is not this the course that things are taking in many of the greatest nations of the earth? In Russia, schools and school-books are employed to compel Catholic Poland to embrace a fatal schism, and to acknowledge the supremacy of the Czar in religious matters. In several States of Germany, those who wish to acquire secular knowledge are obliged to imbibe with it the errors of Luther or Calvin, or the still more baneful teachings of rationalism. In Belgium, the Freemasons, called Solidaires, now in power, support colleges and universities with the view of promoting infidelity in a Catholic country; and very lately an illustration of the fatal results thus produced was given in a congress held at Liege, whose acts and blasphemous declarations have scandalized all believers in the Gospel. In Austria, most violent efforts are now made, by an infidel party, to seize on the education of youth, trampling on the rights of the Church, guaranteed by a solemn concordat; whilst in regard to France, we find that the whole empire is thrown into a state of excitement and alarm, by an edict of the minister of public instruction, M. Duruy, committing to the two or three thousand gentlemen, many of them infidels, holding chairs in the government Lyceums and universities, the office of giving public lectures to the tens of thousands of young females who are preparing to become schoolmistresses or governesses, or who are anxious to make themselves acquainted with the higher branches of science. This plan, which, as being dangerous to female modesty, and well calculated to introduce infidelity into every family, is meeting with the greatest opposition in France, was perhaps borrowed from a modern Dublin institution, the Alexandra College, where, as it is stated, several young Protestant ladies are receiving daily lectures in the sciences from the professors of Trinity College. The dangerous direction given to education at present is still further illustrated by the example of Switzerland, where, only a few days ago, the supreme council of Berne, by a public decree, has taken away the charge of schools from all teachers belonging to religious congregations, and enacts that such persons shall not be allowed to interfere in educational matters for the future. Thus it is evident that the powers of the world, always hostile to God, are generally endeavouring to make education a mere secular matter, to confine the Church and her ministers to the sacristy, and to train up the rising generations with no knowledge, or a very imperfect knowledge, of

religious practices and doctrines. The socialist and the infidel are thus gratifying their hatred of the Church of God, but at the same time they are undermining the foundations of society, and preparing the way for anarchy and revolution, always congenial to men who have been brought up without a knowledge of the maxims and restraints of religion.

Turning to ourselves, is not Ireland menaced with the same evils as other countries? and are not attempts made to secularize education, and to banish from it the hallowing influences of religion? If a Loftus and a Boulter, a Cecil and a Strafford, no longer use the axe and the gibbet to force Protestant teaching on a Catholic people, is it not true that there are still many so hostile to the creed of S. Patrick and S. Laurence, of Bossuet and Fenelon, that, in order to supplant it, they would consent that children should grow up without any religion, or be poisoned with incredulity and atheism?

You are all aware of the events which brought on our present difficulties and struggles. In the sixteenth century, Henry VIII., and his daughter, Elizabeth, having assumed the headship of the Church, and wishing to imbue their subjects with their own doctrines, and to make them imitators of their own unholy works, determined to introduce a new system of instruction for the rising generations, and to suppress every plan of teaching not in harmony with their own views; in a word, these two despots, who are extolled by Protestant historians as great supporters of liberty of conscience, resolved to rob fathers and mothers of their parental rights over the education of their children, and to despoil the Church of the authority given to her by Christ, to instruct all nations, to teach the truths of revelation, and to prevent the spread of error. With this view, notwithstanding the protestations, petitions, and complaints of the people, all monasteries, convents, colleges, and other places of education were seized on, and their properties confiscated, thus leaving our Catholic ancestors without means of bringing up their children in the true faith. To perpetuate this state of affairs, a most cruel code of penal laws was enacted against Catholic schools and schoolmasters at home, and against parents sending their children to foreign countries to be instructed in their own creed.

Things remained in this deplorable condition for a long period, during which the boasted promoters of reformation and enlightenment left nothing undone to reduce the country to the lowest state of ignorance and degradation. If a spark of knowledge was preserved, that blessing is due to Rome, France, Spain, and Belgium, which opened the halls of their colleges and universities to the exile from Erin suffering for his faith,

and to the courage of Irish youths, who, in their thirst for learning, did not hesitate to seek it beyond the seas, though they knew that on their return home they would be exposed to the operation of the most cruel laws for having done so.

Whilst all Catholic education was banished by confiscation and penal enactments from our shores, everything possible was done to encourage Protestantism, and to provide means for propagating its doctrines. Parochial schools, Erasmus Smith's schools, royal colleges, charter schools, and other institutions were gradually established, at the public expense, or from confiscated property, for the purpose of rooting out Catholicity, and establishing the church of Henry VIII. and Elizabeth. To strengthen the operation of these minor establishments, and to bind them together, a great university was founded at the end of the sixteenth century, and gradually enriched with State endowments, or with property confiscated from Catholics. To say nothing of other sources of income, this university, destined by its founder, Elizabeth, to be the bulwark of Protestantism and the bane of Catholicity in Ireland, possesses at present 199,000 acres of land, and has under its control thirty-one rich benefices of the Establishment.

In later times, those purely Protestant establishments have been supplemented by other schools, and principally by the Queen's Colleges, established on principles which exclude all Catholic teaching, and so favourable to indifferentism and infidelity, that Christ's Vicar on earth has declared them dangerous to faith and morals, and the faithful people of Ireland have always looked on them as a gigantic scheme of godless education.

These few statements show how much has been done, in a spirit of hostility, against the teaching of the ancient Church, and with the view of forcing Protestantism on this country. Let us now see what has been done for Catholics, in the way of public education, since the penal code was revoked towards the end of the last century. Have they been put on a footing of equality with their other fellow-subjects? Have effectual steps been taken to obliterate the memory of past grievances, and to remove the effects of confiscation and persecuting laws? Certainly not. Indeed the laws against education were repealed, but nothing was done to heal past wounds. Our rulers virtually said to the people: You have been robbed of your educational endowments, but we will make no compensation for your sufferings and losses; provide, as best you can, for yourselves; the vested rights of a great and wealthy system of Protestant education, in the midst of the country, must be upheld, and even supplemented by new grants for mixed or anti-Catholic institutions.

But what of that? Your poverty is an accomplished fact, we cannot take it into account; but you have no reason to complain, as we allow you to retrieve past losses if you can, and to compete with institutions that have been rendered rich and powerful with your spoils.

Acting in this spirit, the Government, since the repeal of the penal laws, has contributed nothing for the Catholic education of the country, if you except the grant to Maynooth; nothing has been done to promote university, intermediate, or middle education in a Catholic sense; even the National Schools have no Catholic character about them. Catholics, indeed, avail themselves of them, but under very galling conditions. Catholic books, Catholic religious emblems, Catholic prayers, even the sign of the cross, are banished from those schools in class-hours; and the mere mention of the Catholic Church, or of her supreme head, is prohibited in them: indeed, the whole system seems to have been destined to keep Catholic children from getting a full knowledge of their religion, and at the same time to accustom them to the cold and heartless language of a Calvinistic Carlyle or a freethinking archbishop, and to look up with respect and veneration to the words and lectures of heterodox and rationalistic professors. The object of the system was also to deluge the country with books devoid of everything religious, and calculated to weaken or destroy all Catholic feeling: hence Protestants were selected to compile those books for the use of Catholics, and no encouragement was given to Catholic authors. In fine, by circulating the publications of the National Board at a very low price, and this was done by the assistance of the treasury, a bar was put upon the use of Catholic school-books, and Catholic writers were deterred from compiling them.

Having seen how little has hitherto been done by the Government for the education of our Catholic people, I shall now state what our demands ought to be. I shall do so as briefly as possible, as I am sure that this subject will be fully discussed by some of the reverend gentlemen here present. In the first place, then, I say that we ought never to rest satisfied until a Catholic system of education shall be granted to the Catholics of this country. Living in an empire which grants liberty of conscience to all, we have a full claim that the Catholic religion, which we believe to be the only true religion, should be made the basis and the foundation of education for Catholics, and that the rights of parents and of the Catholic Church over the instruction of Catholic children should be respected; but, at the same time, we do not interfere with the pretensions of others, nor do we demand that their numbers and wants

should be overlooked: what we require is fair play, to be put on a footing of equality with our fellow-subjects, and to be enabled to obtain secular knowledge for children, united with a good religious education, exempt from danger to faith and morals.

In the second place, I think that a system of education free from State control is necessary for us. A Government, consisting of men of every religion, holding the most contradictory opinions, and generally imbued with hostility to the Catholic Church or disregard for its teaching, cannot be a safe guide for Catholics in educational matters. As a matter of fact, whenever the rulers of this world undertake to instruct youth, confiding the management of that important duty to a department of the State, the greatest evils arise; society and public authority are shaken, and infidelity and irreligion are promoted: in a word, when Catholics are swindled out of their religion, and hostile doctrines intruded on them, they do not embrace Protestantism, but they become enemies of God, and rebels against the State. Our great countryman, Edmund Burke, points out these unhappy results. In a letter of 1796, to Dr. Hussey, bishop of Waterford, he says: "We frequently agreed that if the Catholics were seduced or bullied from the only religion they have, or can have, they must fall into indifference, or into actual Atheism, or its concomitant direct tendency, actual rebellion." These words are well worthy of the consideration of our statesmen, and the disciples of Dr. Whately, who seem to think that to prevent religious teaching, and to banish Catholicity from the school, is a proof of great political address and skill; but let them take care lest this worldly wisdom, always hostile to God, should lead the rising generations far astray, and bring them in the end into the abyss of sedition and revolution. Undoubtedly, such are the fruits of mixed education: banishing religion from the school and the schoolbook, it is well adapted to shake religious convictions, and to propagate freethinking and contempt for authority in every country where it is established.

In the third place, we have a right to a free Catholic University, chartered and well-endowed, in proportion to our wants and the number of our population. Catholics have shown their anxiety for the acquirement of every branch of knowledge, by the sacrifices they have made in erecting a Catholic University, which, though opposed by most powerful influences, beset with the greatest difficulties, and refused a charter, has acquired a high position in the country, and rendered important services to the arts and sciences. But Catholics, though accustomed and prepared to make every sacrifice

to secure Catholic education for their sons, ought not to be thrown on their own resources whilst university education is provided for others, and for the richer classes, at the public expense. But why not go to Trinity College, or the Queen's Colleges? Simply because they are anti-Catholic institutions, and unfit for the education of Catholics; and, also, because it is an insult and an injustice to Catholics to tell them that they must expect no other education for their children but that which will be given to them by Protestants. Would Protestants rest satisfied if they were told that they should hand over their children to Catholic teachers to educate them, and that, whilst university education would be provided by the State for Catholics, no similar privilege would be granted to Protestants? I need not say that the atmosphere of the Dublin University is thoroughly Protestant; that its teaching is anti-Catholic; that its provost and professors are generally clergymen of the Established Church; and that hundreds of young men who entered that institution good Catholics, left its walls filled with bitter hostility against the faith of their fathers, and zealous defenders of a heretical creed. Even if they did not become open apostates, they gave up Catholic practices, they neglected prayer and the sacraments, and they lived in a habitual disregard or contempt of the Catholic Church. The Queen's Colleges are likely to produce still worse effects, and to shake the very foundations of Christianity.

Such being the case, let me ask, Are Catholic parents who send their child to such establishments free from blame? Can mere temporal considerations justify them for thrusting him into the furnace of danger, and exposing his immortal soul to the risk of eternal perdition? In the eye of every Christian, the parents who are so reckless of the salvation of their child, incur the greatest responsibility. Do they not seem to be guided by no other motive but self-interest? Are they not so slavish that they ignore their own rights, and are satisfied to receive a mess of pottage from taskmasters by whom they are despised? What does this want of spirit come from? It is a remnant of our past slavery. Many seem to consider themselves as of an inferior race, and to look up to Protestants as something great and venerable. Filled with this servile feeling, and being ignorant of the history, the grandeur, and the doctrines of Catholicity, they seek education at Protestant sources; they persuade themselves that this is the only way to make their children respectable; and they overlook the importance of faith and of eternal salvation.

The question of sending Catholic youth to Protestant universities, has been warmly discussed of late in England; and all the bishops of that kingdom have agreed to exercise their influence against so dangerous a practice. The Holy See has given its wise sanction to their determination; and I am happy to be able to give the following extracts from a letter of the Propaganda upon so important a question. The Sacred Congregation says to the English bishops:—

"You will clearly explain in your pastoral letter the doctrine of the Church about avoiding the dangers of mortal sin, to which no one without grievous sin can expose himself, unless under the pressure of serious and adequate necessity, and unless such precautions be employed as may remove the proximate danger of sin. In the present case, where, as his Holiness has declared, those who frequent the universities incur an intrinsic and most grievous danger to purity of morals, as well as to faith (which is absolutely necessary to salvation), who can fail to see that it is next to impossible to discover circumstances which would allow Catholics without sin to attend non-Catholic universities? The light and unstable minds of youth; the errors which in such institutions are imbibed, almost through the atmosphere, without being counteracted by more solid doctrine; the very great power which human respect and the taunts of companions exercise upon young men, lead them so readily and so immediately into the danger of falling, that generally no sufficient reason can be conceived why young men should be entrusted to these universities. Such being the case, you in your wisdom will so use the arguments of authority and reason in publishing the letter, that it may at length be clearly seen, as well by all the clergy as by the faithful, what it is their duty to think and to do in this most grave matter."

Do not these authoritative words show that the parents who immolate to Moloch, not the bodies, like the Jews, but the souls of their children, and who expose them to lose their faith and the hope of eternal salvation, are unworthy of the favours and sacraments of the Church? Do they not also prove that confessors cannot with a good conscience give them absolution, as long as they refuse to fulfil their parental duty, by providing a Catholic education for the offspring committed to their care by God?

In the fourth place, it is our duty to require that Catholics shall be put on a footing of equality with others in regard to intermediate schools. In reference to this branch of public instruction, we are in the same position as in regard to university education. For Protestants, who are rich and powerful, and have all the influence and patronage of the empire in their

hands, everything has been done; and high schools, well endowed with public property, are maintained in many parts of the country, to give an education almost eleemosynary to Protestant children. For the great majority of the people, and for those whose property was confiscated, nothing whatever has been done. Is this civil equality or justice? However, the Catholics have done a great deal for themselves; they have erected schools, seminaries, and colleges, in which classical knowledge and the sciences are cultivated; they have done all this without getting the smallest assistance from the State. Though we have a just claim to equality with others, and ought to insist upon participating in any advantages they enjoy, yet it is quite necessary that we should preserve our intermediate educational institutions in their present independence, and free from all Government control.

In the last place, referring to primary instruction, I shall merely say that we ought to call for a system of education based on and intertwined with religion. Parents are obliged to instil the fear and love of God into the hearts of their children from their earliest days, to teach them to do for the glory of their Creator whatever they undertake, and to inspire them with respect for the Catholic Church and its practices and doctrines. Where a good system of education prevails, the work commenced by parents is continued in the school, and children are taught, not merely the rudiments of secular knowledge, but also the duties which as Catholics they are obliged to perform. It is in this way the Christian Brothers deal with their pupils. They teach them the great truths of religion; they make them pray regularly and approach the sacraments, and perform all the acts of good Christians and sincere Catholics. Children trained in this way will be useful members of society, and at the same time will be able to secure the end of their creation, the salvation of their souls. Yet the Commissioners of Education have adopted a rule by which Christian Brothers, and all men bound by vows, are excluded from teaching in the National Schools. Is not this a proof of the anti-Catholic spirit of the Board, and of its determination to prevent Catholic instruction as much as possible?

A great statesman of France, M. Guizot, a man well versed in educational matters, and admired by all Europe for his philosophical researches, confirms by his authority the observations we have made. "In order," says he, "to make popular education truly good and socially useful, it must be fundamentally religious. I do not simply mean by this, that religious instruction should hold its place in popular education, and that the practices of religion should enter into it; for a nation is

not religiously educated by such petty and mechanical devices; it is necessary that national education should be given and received in the midst of a religious atmosphere, and that religious impressions and religious observances should penetrate into all its parts.

"Religion is not a study or an exercise to be restricted to a certain place and a certain hour; it is a faith and a law, which ought to be felt everywhere, and which after this manner alone can exercise all its beneficial influence upon our minds and our lives."—(*Guizot Memoires*, t. 3, p. 69 : Paris, 1860.) Could anything stronger be said in condemnation of the National System which is forced upon Ireland?

Under this mixed system, all that is most essential to education, all that is necessary for the eternal destiny of man, is banished from the schools; and during the long hours of class, children are doomed to live as if there were no religion or no God. Prayer is not practised, the pupils are not reminded of the divine presence, they are not prepared for the sacraments; they are trained to think only of things temporal, and to forget all supernatural motives for their actions. The school-books contain nothing Catholic, and are only calculated to inspire a mere rationalistic spirit, such as Dr. Whately was distinguished for. Thus everything is done to stunt the growth of Catholic truth, and to leave Catholic youth totally unfit to give an account of the faith that is in them, and to defend their religion against the many enemies that assail it. What can children trained in this way become, but cold, indifferent, and lukewarm Christians?

These negative effects are very bad; but there are other evils connected with the system which are still more to be deplored. In the training and model schools, Protestant and Catholic children are congregated together, the teaching is committed to masters and mistresses of every church and every sect, and the pupils are thus led to think that there is no distinction between truth and error, between Catholicity and heretical sects. Besides, the care of infants, as if to fill their tender minds with puritanical and anti-Catholic sourness, is invariably committed to Presbyterian mistresses. Hence these training schools are nothing but Queen's Colleges in miniature, and like them are dangerous to faith and morals. It was for this reason that the Irish bishops issued an order that Catholics should not present themselves for training in these schools, or that, if they were trained in them, they should not be employed as teachers of Catholic children. This prohibition is to be rigorously enforced, lest those schools should fill the country with teachers either indifferent to religion, or

hostile to the true Church, and throw the education of the country into the hands of a Government always opposed to the Catholic Church.

We are told that the institution of the National System was a great proof of Protestant liberality; for my part I do not see any great illustration of kind feelings in the establishment of a system such as we have described, which appears to have been devised to weaken Catholic faith in children, and to put every possible restriction on the teaching of Catholic doctrine. If some of the originators of the system deserve credit for large and generous views, its principal founder and defender certainly does not deserve that praise. The late Dr. Whately was the life of the National Board for many years, and he appears to have inspired his own spirit into it. He was also considered to be an open and sincere man, most trustworthy in all his dealings. Now what object had he in view in promoting this Government scheme of public instruction? We owe a great debt of gratitude to Miss Whately for letting us into his secrets, and revealing to us what his designs were in regard to Catholics. I give Dr. Whately's own words, as preserved by his daughter (vol. ii. p. 245-6 of Dr. Whately's Life): "The education," says he, "supplied by the National Board is gradually undermining the vast fabric of the Irish Roman Catholic Church. . . . . I believe that mixed education is gradually enlightening the mass of the people; and that if we give it up, we give up the only hope of weaning the Irish from the abuses of Popery. But I cannot venture openly to profess this opinion; I cannot support the Education Board as an instrument of conversion. I have to fight its battle with one hand, and that my best, tied behind me." The same sentiments were uttered in a charge to the clergy of Kildare, delivered a few weeks before his death. I make no comment upon the hatred to everything Catholic manifested in those words; but lest they should ever be forgotten, I think it useful to repeat them from time to time, and always with thankfulness to Miss Whately. It must have been a great sacrifice on her part to record statements so injurious to the honesty and sincerity of her father; undoubtedly her love of truth overcame her paternal affections.

We cannot be satisfied with such a system, and we ought never to relax our efforts until we obtain Catholic schools for Catholic children—schools like those of the Christian Brothers, in which an excellent religious and secular education is given. Our demands cannot be looked on as extravagant. In England, Catholics have Catholic schools for themselves; in many of the colonies the same rule prevails; we merely ask for what has been granted to England and other countries.

In the year 1861 a Royal Commission, having examined the feelings of the people of England, presented to Parliament a most decided report in favour of denominational education based on religion. Allow me to read the following extracts :—

"We think that the existing plan (the denominational one) is the only one by which it would be possible to secure the religious character of popular education. It is unnecessary for us to enter upon proof of the assertion that this is desirable in itself. It is enough for our purpose to say that there is strong evidence that it is the deliberate opinion of the great majority of persons in this country (England), that it is desirable. Some evidence has already been given upon this subject of the feelings of the parents of the children to be educated. Those of the nation at large are proved by the fact, that, with hardly an exception, every endowment for purposes of education, from the university down to the smallest village school, has been connected by its founders with some religious body. . . . .

"The controversies which have occurred in the course of the last twenty years, the difficulties which they have thrown in the way of the establishment of any comprehensive (*i.e.*, united or mixed) system, and their practical result in the establishment of the denominational training colleges and elementary schools, appear to us to place beyond all doubt the conclusion, that the great body of the population are determined that *religion and education must be closely connected;* and we do not think that any other principle than that which is the base of the present system would secure this result." (Report, p. 310.)

The commissioners, then, adopt principles quite opposed to the mixed system, as appears from the following extract :—

"It has been supposed that the object of securing the religious character of education might be equally attained either by restricting the teaching given in the schools to points upon which different denominations agree, or by drawing a broad line between the religious and secular instruction, and by providing that the religious instruction should be given at particular hours, and by the ministers of different denominations. We do not think that either of these expedients would be suitable to the state of feeling in this country. . . . . .

"The plan [continue the same commissioners], of drawing a line between religious and secular instruction, and confining the religious instruction to particular hours, would, we believe, be equally unlikely to succeed. The principal promoters of education maintain that such a line cannot be drawn, and that every subject which is not merely mechanical, such as writing and working sums, but is connected with the feelings and conduct of mankind, may and ought to be made the occasion of

giving religious instruction. They maintain that the religious influence of the school depends no less upon the personal character and example of the teacher, upon the manner in which he administers discipline, upon the various opportunities which he takes for enforcing religious truth, and on the spirit in which he treats his pupils, and teaches them to treat each other, than upon the distinctive religious teaching." (Ibid.)

But it is said that the circumstances of Ireland are not favourable to the denominational system, that the mixed system is very popular, that it is promoting charity and peace, and that it excludes all danger of proselytism. In reply, I say that there are more riots and disturbances, more party strifes in some counties of the north of Ireland, where the mixed system prevails to a certain extent, than in all the other counties where education is practically denominational. I add, that the true way to promote peace and charity is to inspire children with religious sentiments, and to instruct them in the truths of the Gospel and the practices of the Church—advantages that cannot be obtained under the mixed system.

As to proselytism, it appears to me that it is sanctioned by the rules of the National Board, and that it is practised with impunity under the eyes of the Commissioners. Proselytism works in two ways: firstly, by keeping Catholic children from learning Catholic or even any religious doctrines whatever; secondly, by teaching anti-Catholic doctrines. Now, if you look to the Rules of the Board (sec. iv. 9), you will find that every patron has the right of excluding all religious instruction from his schools, and thus of condemning children, as far as the school is concerned, to a pagan ignorance of Christianity. Is not that an effectual system of proselytism? In the second place, if you examine the parliamentary returns, lately obtained by Mr. O'Reilly, M.P. for Longford, you will see that in National Schools, of which Presbyterians are patrons, thousands of Catholic children receive religious instruction from Presbyterian masters, recite anti-Catholic prayers, and read the Protestant version of the Bible. Is not this direct proselytism? Happily the system has been prevented from producing the worst effects by the Catholicity and other circumstances of the country.

In the next place, it is quite clear that neither the Protestants nor the Catholics of Ireland appear desirous to send their children to the same school. Is it not the case that in very many towns and parishes there are Protestant and Catholic National Schools, and Protestants never enter the Catholic school, and the Catholics never attend the Protestant school? We have an illustration of this here in Dublin. There are in the city sixty

National Schools under Catholic control, with 24,355 Catholic children on the roll. How many Protestants are on the same rolls? Only six, to whom are to be added four Jews. Does this show a great love for mixed education?

But let us take all Ireland. According to the Report of the Board for 1866, we find there are in all Ireland—

Schools.	Catholic Children.	Protestants.
2,454 with Catholic teachers, and	373,756	None.
2,483 with Catholic teachers,	321,641 only	24,381.
1,106 with Protestant teachers only	29,722 and	114,726.
184 with Protestant teachers only,	none and	18,702.
131 with mixed teachers,	13,690 and	13,305.

No commentary is necessary on these figures; they show that mixed education has not taken root in Ireland. This failure cannot be attributed to want of means or influence on the part of the promoters of the system. Ever since the establishment of the National Board, Government has left nothing undone to encourage and promote its progress. Since 1832, six millions have been voted for this purpose; during the same period, hundreds of thousands of people died of starvation, or were driven to seek the means of living beyond the ocean, but those who were so liberal in grants for mixed education, could scarcely afford anything to relieve the material wants of such multitudes. Would it not have been more Christian-like that the lives of the people should have been first protected, and then provision made for their intellectual wants?

It may be interesting to consider how much is expended in one year for keeping up the working machinery of the mixed system, or encouraging its progress. In the year 1866, the whole amount that passed through the hands of the Commissioners was £340,820, no small matter in a country where thousands are living in the most abject poverty. Omitting the salaries of teachers, I shall mention some other items of the expenditure. £15,129 were expended on the central office; £26,926, on inspection and organization; £39,653, on training, model, and other official schools; £26,952, in salaries and premiums to monitors, etc.; and £17,492 in the book department,—all these sums, amounting to £126,152, have a direct tendency to promote the mixed system; the premiums given to monitors may be looked on as bribes to attach them to the system; the vast expenditure on the book department can be considered as nothing but a grant to engage writers to defend mixed education, preventing, at the same time, the compilation of Catholic school-books, and forcing on the country works

calculated to deaden religious feelings, and to make Catholics indifferent to the teaching of their Church.

Yet, with all the impulse given by six millions, with all the inducements or bribes held out to a poor population anxious for knowledge, the statistics we have referred to show that, at the end of thirty-five years, there are 2,454 schools with 373,756 Catholic pupils, and without a single Protestant child; 2,483 schools, with 321,641 Catholic pupils, and only 24,381 Protestant children; that is, with an average of less than 10 Protestants to each school. On the other hand, there are 184 schools with 18,702 Protestants and not a single Catholic; and 1,105 schools with 114,726 Protestant children and only 29,722 Catholics; that is, with an average of about 26 Catholic children to each school, or with an attendance of 12 or 13. As to the 131 schools in which mixed teaching prevails, they are generally official schools, kept up with extravagant expense, and established without any regard to the feeling of the country. Thus it is evident that the mixed system is not in favour with the people, and that the National Schools cannot be looked on as mixed in regard to the pupils. Is it not then absurd to suppose them mixed, and to subject them, in force of this false hypothesis, to all the disadvantages of a mixed system?

In this state of things, when the children are so well separated as to religion, nothing can be easier than to introduce the denominational system. That system will be hailed with delight by the great mass of the population, and no one will object to it, except some few who, neglecting the care of the children of their own sect, direct all their thoughts to the perversion of Catholics. I need scarcely add, that, after the denominational system shall have been established, no grants should be made to any mixed schools, except on condition that proselytism shall not be allowed.

Having said so much regarding education at home, let us for a moment consider what has been done in some other countries for public instruction, where the population professes different creeds. In Prussia, the mixed system was tried for many years, and created great dissensions and heartburnings in the country. After a long experience, the Government changed its policy, abolished primary mixed schools, acknowledged the rights of both the Catholic and Protestant clergy over their respective flocks, established the denominational system, and in this way promoted good will and harmony to such an extent, that in the late war Catholics and Protestants vied with each other in making sacrifices for their country, and fighting its battles.

Austria is oftentimes denounced for her bigotry. Yet she

supports schools, and colleges, and universities, for a Protestant minority, and puts them on a footing of perfect equality with Catholics, who form the great majority of the population of the empire. Even the fullest authority over schools of their own religion is guaranteed to the ministers of the Calvinistic and Lutheran confessions. What a contrast with the policy adopted in Ireland!

In France, according to the last census, there are about 37 millions of inhabitants. Of these

480,000	are	Calvinists.
267,000		Lutherans.
73,000		Jews.
30,000		Various sects.

The remainder, over 36 millions, are Catholics. Now, how is the very small minority treated? Is the education of their children interfered with, or a mixed system forced on them, in which they are not allowed to teach the special doctrines and practices of their persuasion? Not at all. The Government supports separate primary schools for Lutherans, Calvinists, and Jews, and three seminaries for the higher education of Lutherans and Calvinists.

Acting in this generous way, towards a small non-Catholic minority in their own empire, the French can scarcely believe that the Catholics of Ireland, the great majority of the country, are treated in quite a different spirit by England, whose liberal institutions are so much extolled. When you tell a Frenchman that seven or eight hundred thousand a-year are expended in Ireland for the worship of a handful of Protestants, and not a shilling for the religious wants of four and a-half millions of Catholics, he can scarcely believe such a statement. When you add that there is a system of intermediate schools, and a great university upheld for the middle and higher branches of education for the Protestant minority, whilst nothing is done for the Catholic majority, he becomes still more incredulous. But when you tell him that in 2,454 schools, frequented by 373,756 Catholic children, without one single Protestant among them, the teaching of the Catholic religion, the practice of prayer, the use of religious emblems and books containing any reference to the Catholic Church, or to its supreme Head, are strictly prohibited, he becomes totally bewildered, and cries out that the statesmen who maintain so absurd a system must have no regard for the welfare or the feelings of the country which they govern.

Again, when he hears that Government grants the large sum of £340,000 per annum for the education of the people,

and at the same time not only upholds old abuses, but leaves tens of thousands of those, whom they are educating, in the very depths of poverty, and without any protection, he comes to the conclusion that the rulers of the land have forgotten their own interests and duties, and become demented, and quite reckless as to the safety and permanency of authority. Do they not seem, says he, to be preparing the rising generations for violence and revolution, forcing education upon them, and excluding religion as much as possible? Are they not placing the multitudes in a state to know and to feel with indignation the grievances and insults which they suffer, and taking away the religious principles and restraints which would teach them to bear the miseries of this life with patience and resignation, and as a means of securing happiness in a better world? This, certainly, cannot be considered political wisdom or good statesmanship.

I shall not further trespass on your time, nor deprive you any longer of the pleasure and advantage of hearing the useful and practical suggestions which we may expect from the eloquence and experience of many of the reverend gentlemen here present.

The Very Rev. Dean O'CONNELL, P.P., said—Your Eminence, I feel honoured by being called upon to move what you will allow me to denominate the inaugural resolution of this day's important proceedings. It is :—

"That education, to be a source of blessings, must be animated and controlled by religion; separated from religion, it is productive of innumerable evils to individuals and society."

I take it that this is an absolute truism, that requires no proof. Reason and experience come to our aid on this occasion, and tell us the truth of this resolution. We have been obliged, by our poverty, to avail ourselves of a system of education by no means heartily entered into by us. I must confess we have done so unwillingly; but, recollect, we did not thereby abdicate our right or our privilege to call for an amelioration of that system according to circumstances.

In our National schools, even in the lower schools, to which your Eminence has alluded, we are prevented from using those means which are necessary to keep alive in the hearts of the poor, religion and devotion. We owe it to the parents of those children, and to the children themselves, to do everything in our power to attain the great object of all education, and that is, the salvation of their immortal souls. These children have been received by us at the

baptismal font, and thereby became heirs to the kingdom of heaven. We take them from what I may call the family school, where they are taught the great rudiments of the Christian religion;—we take them from their home, where they are taught to repeat, with reverence and love, the holy name of the Redeemer, and of his blessed Mother, and we bring them to the school, the moral atmosphere of which is cold and cheerless as regards religion and devotion, and the warmth of their little Catholic hearts is absolutely chilled to the core. Therein is allowed no emblem of the Redeemer, nor sign of his blessed Mother, although from their infancy they have been taught adoration of the one, and devotion to the other; therein neither master nor book can allude to either during a long day; religion is, in fact, literally ignored. Is this as it ought to be? I say it is not; and I repeat, we owe it to the parents of those children, and to the children themselves, not to expose them to the danger of losing their faith, or of even lessening their devotion in the smallest possible degree.

I do not wonder that your Eminence is anxious for the establishment of Christian Brothers' schools in all the parishes of the diocese. I am not surprised at it, knowing that such is the constitution of the National schools. I do not wonder that our poor people prefer the Christian Brothers' schools. They know the importance of the early religious education to the dearest objects of their affection. I shall not detain your Eminence longer, because there is not one in this assembly who does not feel as I feel regarding this subject. I am sure the resolutions I see now before me will be spoken to on this occasion in a manner that will impress on the mind of the Government, and on those who have taken education into their hands, the necessity of giving to a Catholic people a Catholic education. These children will grow up to boyhood, and from boyhood to manhood, when they will strive to advance themselves in life. Some may seek a living in a foreign land, and if they be not well and religiously instructed, if religion is not in fact a part of their existence, they will stand in the greatest possible danger. Hence the school should be an atmosphere breathing religion and devotion; and if religion and devotion are not found there, God knows what will be the result.

The Rev. Dr. CURTIS, S.J., seconded the resolution. He said —Your Eminence, Solomon has taught us that there is nothing new under the sun, and we find his inspired words exemplified

in the discussion in which we are engaged. It is by no means new, and it is a subject of surprise, as it is of deep regret, that it should be necessary at the present day to prove that a true and salutary course of education necessarily includes religious instruction. Some half-century back, or about that period, probably when the Lancasterian schools had their origin in a neighbouring island, the question was argued, and on some festive occasion a gentleman was said to have expressed himself in some such terms as the following: "Whatever opinions others may entertain, I call on the company to drink to the success of the three R's, Reading, Riting, and Rithmetic." This gentleman evidently omitted an important branch, of the value of which he seemed to have been unconscious, that of orthography; and if others at the present day desire to exclude religion from education, it is, I fear, because they neither understand, nor love, nor respect religion.

It is certainly a cause of just and serious alarm when we hear it asserted that such opinions gain ground in England. It gives us occasion to fear that the dread system of philosophy called positivism, which has made such rapid progress on the Continent, and which has lately penetrated into the principal university in this country, gains ground among influential men. Positivism is a species of negative or semi-Atheism, and those who adopt it must look on religion as a useless excrescence or an evil in education. Such has never been the opinion of those men, whether in ancient or modern times, whose wisdom and genius have given them a just and well-founded influence over the minds of the civilized world. I shall not dwell on the example of the parents and earliest instructors of the human race, whose history we find in the inspired writings; though in truth, among a people who profess Christianity, their practice should be held paramount, and should decide the question. I prefer, under the circumstances, to appeal to the sages of pagan times and countries, as they may appear to our opponents more impartial. The pagan religion was a bad religion, yet it retained some glimmering of the traditions of truth. It gave some cloudy and imperfect idea of a Creator and of beings to whom religious homage was due, who presided over the duties of men, and were to reward virtue and become the avengers of vice. Its value, therefore, was generally felt and acknowledged, and it was diligently inculcated during the education of the young. Of this you may find proofs in almost every page of ancient writers. There was one exception, and that is presented in the sect of the Epicureans. The followers of Epicurus sought supreme happiness in the indulgence of sensual inclinations alone, and rejected all idea of the felicity of a future state. The estimation,

however, in which they were held by their contemporaries we learn from Horace, who, in his epistle to his friend Tibullus, facetiously represents himself as following their doctrine :—

> "Me pinguem et nitidum, benè curatâ cute vises
> Cum ridere voles, Epicuri de grege porcum."

Those who rejected religion in the education of the young, were those who were classed by the pagans with the most stupid and degraded of the brute creation. There is one deeply important lesson which the rulers of Christian nations of the present day might learn from the kings and emperors of pagan times—the power of religion in facilitating the rule of the governed. As Moses was instructed to do before the tabernacle, it was the constant practice of Gentile princes on all important occasions to propitiate the Deity and seek his direction. I avoid all particular reference to the sages and saints of Catholic times and countries. It is sufficient to remark that they are unanimous without exception in insisting on the necessity of religious instruction during the course of education. A few citations from Protestant authorities will probably be more to the point on the present occasion. I shall quote the words of a few superior men, whose authority should overbalance all opposition. "The great work of education," says Milton, "is to repair the ruin of our first parents by learning to know God aright; to love him, to desire to imitate him as best we may, possessing our souls in true virtue, which being united to true science, makes up the highest attainable perfection." Locke declares that a literary without a virtuous education is rather an evil than a benefit. Passing over other eminent authorities, I hasten to cite the words of two great men, who may be said to be personally known to us. The first are those of Lord Derby. "Religion," says this enlightened nobleman, "is not a thing apart from education, but interwoven with its whole system; and is a principle which regulates and controls the whole mind and happiness of the people." The words of the late Duke of Wellington are still more worthy of note, and do him more honour as a wise and intelligent friend to the human race and to his country, than all his splendid victories : "I hope we shall never rest until we shall find sufficient means for teaching the people of England their duty to their Maker, and their duty to one another founded on their duty to that Maker." Both Lord Derby and his friend have failed to a lamentable degree, for England is the country where above all others, perhaps, irreligion and blasphemy are most applauded, and where impiety, Atheism, and hatred of the Deity are propagated with the most audacious effrontery. They are taught without control in the streets and squares, and in the light of the sun.

In England some of the most distinguished ministers of the prevalent religion teach that the divine revelations are but fable and allegory, and the consequences of all this are evident in the conduct of the people towards each other. On the authority of English writers and public documents we know that immorality—I might use a stronger but more offensive word—has long infected the people as a leprosy, and child-murder and poisoning among relations prevail to an extent beyond the power of the laws to control.

Did the defects in their own education allow the two great men whom I have named to judge aright—did his inveterate prejudices allow the great victorious Duke to employ in this matter that accurate and unclouded perception that enabled him in the field to apportion the assailing to the resisting force, he would have perceived that the defect was in the religious teaching on which he depended, and that it contained elements of weakness that neutralize its effects. This we may see exemplified a little further on. The fact is, that those who know what true education and true religion imply, can never entertain a doubt that they must be inseparable. What is education? I answer, it is nothing more or less than a training of the human being for the performance of those duties which the Creator has destined him to discharge in this world—duties which regard God, his fellow-creatures, and himself.

It is of great importance to comprehend well the necessity and the efficacy of this training. Men know the necessity of training the inferior animals destined byDivine Providence for their use. The horse, when trained, and, if I may employ the word, educated, is invaluable to man; but an untrained horse is a very worthless and a very dangerous animal. The habits produced by training are more powerful and tenacious often than the natural instinct of animals, and they can be trained to habits which seem even contrary to their nature. The parrot can be taught the use of human speech, and we are told of one that could repeat its Latin grammar, and put to the blush the idle schoolboy. Singing birds can be trained to warble the compositions of Mozart and Rossini; the pony has been exhibited with skill to discharge the pistol; and the diminutive flea has been taught to forget its bounding propensity, and to drag in harness the miniature cannon. These prodigies of training are surpassed in the education of the human mind, to which I return with one remark, that the use of the cannon and of the revolver, of the sword and the stiletto, is intimately connected with such training. The importance and effects of education are most clearly observed in the religion, customs, and manners of the various races of mankind. It is education which moulds and colours the religious opinions, the principles

of conduct and manners, of the Chinese, the Hindoos, the Mahomedans, and even of the savages who dwell in the wilds of Africa and America. All these people share in the common privileges of man; they are possessed of reason and free will; and can choose between what they suppose to be wisdom and folly, virtue and vice. There are many amongst them distinguished for a high range of intellect and natural energies of mind. Yet they are found universally to adopt the monstrous absurdities taught, and to practise the foul and hideous orgies inculcated by their various systems of superstition, and adhere to them with an obstinacy that would require the miracles of a Xavier, or the omnipotent grace of the Redeemer to overcome. Nay, it is only with the few that such miracles and such grace become effectual. The great number of those thus educated from their early years, retain the hideous colouring of their minds while life endures. The process of education on the minds of men is very accurately exemplified in that of the dyer, who communicates to various substances colours which they have not from nature? How does the dyer proceed? He applies to the material the colour which he desires to impart, black, brown, or green; he mingles with his preparation other substances possessed of chemical properties that fix the colour and render it tenacious and indelible. What would be the effect should his mixture contain substances calculated to neutralize or weaken the colour? Undoubtedly it would soon lose its depth or brilliancy, or totally disappear.

It is ever thus in the process of education on the mind. The religious or other opinions captivate the understanding and chain the will while they are still weak and tender in infancy and childhood. Everything seen by the child, everything he hears, tends to fasten in his mind and soul the impressions made by instruction. All around, above, and beneath him, exhibit the same examples and speak the same language. The king or ruler whose name and power fill him with awe, the parents and relatives whom he venerates and loves, the teachers who are prodigies of wisdom and knowledge in his eyes, the companions who surround him during his studies and amusements, the menials who administer to his wants—all tend, during the long years of his education, to confirm and fix indelibly the first impressions. His memory, his will and understanding, are deeply imbued and impregnated, and the affections of his heart and the tendencies of his nature concur to deepen and fortify the convictions of his mind. It is thus that the minds and souls of millions become dyed, if I may so speak, with the colour of the Chinese, the Hindoo, and the Mahomedan, and it is thus also that the Christian must be formed.

The human soul must take its mould and colour from education and not from nature, in order to assume its place among the religious or other classes of men. Take an infant born of Christian parents; let those parents be distinguished to the highest degree for heroic faith and sanctity,—place that infant among Jews, or Hindoos, or Mahomedans, or other infidels, and let it be educated by them; when arrived at maturity that individual will not retain or exhibit a vestige of Christianity that can be discovered by human eyes; its soul will be indelibly penetrated with the religious teaching of those by whom he or she may have been educated. On the contrary, follow the same course with the child of Jews, Mahomedans, or Hindoos, and place it for education among Christians. That child in mature years will be as much a Christian as if born of such parents. Nothing in this statement admits of doubt. The sole difference is, that, to form the sincere Christian, more care is required to render the practice conformable to the doctrine. In the case of Jews and infidels, if men be required to control some passions and submit to some privations, their religious opinions leave them at liberty, and often encourage them, to indulge the worst and lowest tendencies of their nature. The Christian, if he would be faithful, must subdue and control every corrupt inclination of his heart. But what would be the case if, in the education of the child, there should be found conflicting and contradictory elements, some of which tend to neutralize and destroy the effects of the others? Then, undoubtedly, the consequences would be the same as in the case of the unskilful dyer. The impressions sought to be made would never be fixed or permanent; they would soon fade, or altogether disappear.

This is precisely the error that has rendered abortive the benevolent desire of the Duke of Wellington with regard to the people of England, and which ever must destroy the effects of Protestant religious education wherever it prevails. In England that Sacred Volume which contains the revelations of God is placed in the hands of the young; they are taught to read it with care, to commit it to memory; but as a primary principle to submit to no man's dictation regarding the meaning of what it contains. They are to take it without note or comment, and to fashion from it their own religious opinions. They find all above, beneath, and around them at variance. The sovereign entertains one opinion, the subject the contrary. Their parents profess one doctrine, their teachers another. Those who are most distinguished for knowledge, wisdom, and apparent sanctity, those whom they esteem, love, and venerate most, mutually condemn and ridicule the religious opinions one of the other. Some of the most distinguished and learned

amongst the ministers of religion declare that the contents of the Sacred Volume contain nothing more respectable than allegories and fables. On the other hand, they find in the Divine Word apparent contradictions, which they have not sufficient knowledge or intelligence to reconcile. They find mysteries taught which appear contradictory to that reason to which lies their sole appeal; they find a law which chains down all their strongest and most cherished inclinations. This law, they are told by many doctors, is unnecessary for salvation, as faith is all-sufficient; others declare it to be impossible. What can the intelligent youth conclude from all this? Can he justly form any other opinion than this, that there is nothing certain in religion? Can we be surprised if he should come to the decision that there is much of absurdity in it?—that he should reject a law at once so onerous, so severe, and yet so problematical, or, in fact, that he should reject altogether a revelation which is so little calculated to satisfy that reason, of which men so proudly boast, and the subjugation of which they find it so difficult to endure?

There is one religion in which no danger of this kind can arise, and that is the Roman Catholic. In that no difference of opinion can exist on any point; all must submit to the decision of the Church and its visible head, the Vicar of Jesus Christ. In that Church there is but one faith and one law, and therefore it is that house of the prudent man described by the Redeemer, erected not on the shifting sands of human opinion, but on the immovable Rock. Those educated in that religion, therefore, profess convictions fixed and unalterable. Their souls are deeply and indelibly impregnated with the truths of revelation, and the happy fruits are to be discovered in their own souls and in their conduct towards their fellow-creatures. No human mind can conceive or justly estimate the value of those fruits as they regard their own souls, no human tongue can describe them. They are best conveyed in the inspired words of the beloved disciple speaking of the Eternal Word. In a truly religious education, men receive a knowledge of that Word, of whom it is written, "In Him was life, and the life was the light of men—that was the true light that enlighteneth every man that cometh into this world—but as many as received Him, he gave them power to become the sons of God, to them that believe in his name."—John, i. A truly religious education, therefore, illumines the soul of man with that light that beams from the very bosom of the Eternal Father, and thus illumined it becomes the child of God. It is by such an education alone that men are placed in a position to imitate their Creator, according to the just idea of Milton, by the exercise of every true virtue, and to realize the benevolent desire

of Wellington, to discharge their duties towards each other through a sense of duty towards their Maker.

The colours of the celestial bow and of the scientific prism combine to form that pellucid flood poured on the material world by the Omnipotent command, "let light be made," and which clothes all the visible creation in beauty and illumination. God is uncreated light: He also is charity; and it is by the combination of every virtue inculcated by the Divine Commands that true light and charity are engendered, and the image of the Creator perfected in the human soul. How dread are the consequences both to the individual and to society, when those virtues are not cultivated, and those commandments solidly and practically taught in the course of education! How dark and full of horror is the soul of man without religion! It is as that land described by Job—"A land that is dark and covered with the mist of death; a land of misery and darkness, where the shadow of death and no order, but everlasting horror dwelleth."—Job, x. 22. It is dark, for a ray of that divine light which flows from the bosom of the Deity never beams upon it. It is covered with the mist of death, for the source of life is not there. It is never warmed by divine love, nor is it fertilized by the celestial dews of grace. It is a land of misery and darkness, as God, the source of every good, is absent, and never illumines it with the bliss-creating sunshine of his smile. No order is there to be found, for there is no law but that of the obscured and perverted reason, and of the corrupt inclinations of the heart of man. That soul is the dwelling of ceaseless horror, for the spirits of darkness rule and revel in it; it is now their slave, and it is doomed to be so for eternity, for the vivifying hope of heavenly felicity is not for that soul. Such is the state of thousands at the present moment, and they have been reduced to it by an irreligious and godless education.

What would be the social condition of a nation or a people composed of such individuals? The question is answered by the history of the last century; and although the facts may be familiar to all who hear me, yet it will not be entirely useless briefly to sketch them. As far as the middle of the eighteenth century, the French, as a nation, were a highly religious people. Their missionaries, protected and encouraged by the Government, propagated with unceasing zeal the Christian religion in the most distant quarters of the globe. Before the year 1770, the principal schools in which a religious education was imparted to the young, were closed through the influence of the Jansenist heretics, and that of some leading men of irreligious character. Thirty years had not passed when the consequences became apparent. The generation which had grown up under

the new system of education had come to maturity, and they manifested their spirit. It seemed as if legions of demons had escaped from their prison in the dark abyss, and taken possession of the French people. Religion was proscribed—the divine worship was abolished by law—the clergy were massacred—and an infamous courtezan, with the title of the Goddess of Reason, was enthroned in the place of God, and paraded in impious procession. The sovereign, with his amiable and unoffending queen, were butchered, myriads of innocent people were put to death by the guillotine or drowned in the noyades, as they were termed, being tied back to back, and thrown at dead of night into the rivers or sea. At the same time ballads were circulated among the populace to hound them on to deeds of blood. The refrain or chorus of one ran thus :—

"Du sang, du sang, il faut du sang,
Pour régénérer la république."

The French now assumed a new mission—to propagate irreligion and impiety, and to carry sacrilege and devastation into every country around them. The French people have to a great extent recovered from their frenzy; but Europe still bleeds under the effects, and it may be long ere her wounds are healed, if ever that happiness can be expected.

It is of importance to bear all this in mind, at a moment when the public is engaged in discussing systems of education, and the Government seem undecided as to that which they may adopt. Three systems are proposed—a system from which religious instruction is excluded; the system of mixed education, as it is termed; and that which is called denominational. From what has been said, we can conclude what would be the probable effects of the first; we can form an opinion also to some extent regarding the consequences of the second; it remains to institute briefly a comparison between this second system and the last which has been named. In order to do this we must engage in some details.

I should ask a Christian Government to consider whether they will best discharge their duty, and most effectually secure peace, submission to the laws, social order and harmony, and the happiness of the people; whether they will most perfectly, in fine, realize the just and benevolent desire of Wellington, by a system of education calculated to destroy or diminish in the minds of the young an attachment to their religion—to sever them from the ministers of that religion, and to raise doubts regarding the truth of every religion? Will the peace and happiness of a Christian people be best secured by compelling them to go through their education under teachers who are at liberty to deny, and some of whom actually do reject; the divi-

nity of the great Institutor of the Christian religion? who may, or who actually do, consider the divine revelations in the light of allegories and fables? who may, or who actually do, hold the commandments of God to be impossible or unnecessary for salvation? In one system of education the young are taught that without faith it is impossible to please God; that every word of the Sacred Scriptures that regards faith and morals must be held infallible; that every precept of the divine law must be observed to the letter at the risk of salvation; that "every soul must be subject to higher powers;" . . . . and that "he that resisteth the power resisteth the ordinance of God;" that every man must love his neighbour as himself; and that those who inflict injury on others in person, property, or reputation, must repair such injury, or expect condemnation before the tribunal of the Eternal Judge. In this system the teachers believe that their own eternal welfare depends on their inculcating such doctrines faithfully and practically. Does it conduce to the public peace and welfare either to exclude such teaching, or to compel the young to listen to teachers who are known to look upon such doctrine as doubtful, if they do not actually reject and hold it up to ridicule? I would ask a Government, do they not perceive that by pursuing such a course they are employed in undermining their own authority and the foundations of social order and tranquillity, and in preparing for the country which they rule scenes of civil commotion, anarchy, and bloodshed?

It is for Catholic parents to consider, when they have to select a school or university for the education of their children, whether they can safely choose those establishments where teachers and professors may be found, distinguished in the highest degree by their genius, talents, and acquirements; winning also in their manners, bland and kind in their dispositions, and in every way calculated to fascinate the young, and command their respect and affections, and yet known to entertain opinions destructive to the faith, and even the morals, of those in their charge, and deeply impregnated with hostility and contempt for the religion they profess? In such establishments the peculiar observances of the Catholic Church and the Holy Sacraments are almost universally condemned, and even held in derision; and in the minds of some the very foundations of faith and Christianity are shaken or uprooted. Are parents justified in exposing their children to such influences, so perilous to their eternal and even their temporal welfare, because some, under favourable circumstances, may escape utter ruin? Who can say that even one escapes without important injury? Are the young to be exposed to such influences at an age when their passions are

almost uncontrollable, and when the most tender and vigilant parental care can with difficulty secure fidelity to the duties of religion ?

The best interests of families, as well as those of society at large, are deeply involved in the religious education of the wealthier classes. They are equally so in the proper training of the inferior ranks of the community. They form the great masses of the people, and from them the multitudes are drawn to supply the trades and all the various branches of external and domestic servants. How utterly do the higher classes depend upon them ! If they be thoroughly religious and submissive to their ecclesiastical superiors, they will be full of probity, temperate, and moral; the property of those who employ them, and, a yet more inestimable treasure, children, will be safe in their hands. If, on the contrary, they shall have acquired, during their education, a want of solidity in their religious impressions, and of steadiness in their faith ; if, through the example of those teachers whom they have looked upon as prodigies and oracles for their wisdom and the extent of their knowledge, they may have learned to entertain doubts of the religion which they have been taught, or of the stringent nature of the divine law ; or if they have ceased to love and value the observances of religion,—society will have lost the most solid and effectual guarantee for public and private virtue that Divine Providence has granted to man. Irreligion and impiety will pervade the people widely and profoundly ; that leprosy mentioned by Bulwer, in his work on England and the English, and which has silently but deeply infected so many other countries of Europe, will spread its odious contagion ; human laws and the fear of detection will afford no protection against the virus of corruption, which vicious servants and dependants are sure to communicate to the innocent children committed to their care, and but slender protection to the property of those who employ them; domestics will become as vipers and scorpions in the bosoms of families; and mixed education may be found in its effects but little superior to the total prohibition of religious instruction in the course of education.

The Very Rev. Monsignor FORDE moved the next resolution, which was as follows :—

"That we protest against every effort of the State to force upon Catholics any system of education restrictive of the authority of the Church, or inimical to the interests of Catholic parents, whose right and duty it is to impart a religious education to their children."

He said—Your Eminence, my Lord Bishop, and Very Rev. Gentlemen, I take it that the object which brings us together to-day is to consider in all its principles and details the important subject of education, for as this subject is one that occupies the public mind, not only in this country, but all over the world, it is most important that persons in our position should be well and accurately made up upon it, that we may be able to think correctly and speak of it with corresponding accuracy. One great principle, lying at the foundation of this question, has been fully and elaborately expounded by the venerable Ecclesiastics who have just preceded me. Another not less fundamental has been entrusted to me; and I only regret that I cannot deal out to it the same measure of justice which the preceding resolution has received. I can, however, readily supply my own shortcomings by referring to two sources of information, in either of which the subject may be fairly said to be exhausted. The first is a letter well known to us all, addressed some years ago, in the name of the Irish Episcopate, by his Eminence the Archbishop to the then Secretary for Ireland, the Right Hon. Mr. Cardwell*—a document of which, were I speaking of it before the powerful effort of eloquence and of condensed vigour of thought which we witnessed in the Cathedral yesterday,† I would say that, amongst the many valuable and complete contributions to the ecclesiastical literature of the day which have emanated from his Eminence, it is the most valuable and the most complete. The other is accessible to all—indeed I should hope, along with the other numbers of so valuable a periodical, it is in possession of all —I allude to the March number, 1867, of the *Irish Ecclesiastical Record*, in one of the articles of which the principles of this resolution are set forth with such exactness and precision of thought, and corresponding accuracy of expression, that I could not help, when looking over it this morning, regretting that my resolution also was not intrusted to the able hands that penned that article.

The resolution asserts the right and duty of parents to educate their children; that, in fact, education, by the very ordinance of nature, is portion of the parental office; that, in discharge of this office, the parent is aided and supervised by the Church, in virtue of authority received from her Divine Founder; and that for the State to arrogate to itself the office of teacher or educator of youth, is an invasion, to be protested

* Appendix.

† The meeting was held on the day following the Solemn Requiem for the Papal soldiers who fell in defence of the Holy See. The funeral oration, since published, was pronounced by the Cardinal Archbishop.

against, of the natural and divine rights both of parents and of the Church.

That education belongs to the parental office is plain from the arrangement of nature itself. A child is born into this world in a state of the most helpless dependency on his parents, and without the continued aid, supervision, and control of the parent, would become so certainly, both materially and morally, a hopeless outcast upon the earth, that it is to this state of helplessness and dependency that ethical writers appeal as the strongest natural indication of the necessity of the divine ordinance establishing the unity and indissolubility of marriage. And who, on the one hand, so fitted for the task of education as parents, influenced, or I should say rather compelled, by the very instincts of parental affection to seek every means to advance the material and moral welfare of their offspring—an offspring bound on the other hand to the parent by every tie of affection, reverence, and regard, and thus even naturally prepared to receive, as the softest and most pliable wax, the slightest impression which the parent may wish to make upon it? On the parent, therefore, the duty and right of education primarily devolves, and so sacred is this right that the Church recognizes it in its fullest extent, nor will she herself interfere, or allow interference on the part of others, but, on the contrary, denounces as opposed to her laws any such interference with the children of those who are not her subjects by baptism, were it even for the holiest purpose of bringing them up in the religion of Christ.

But in the discharge of this duty the parents may be deficient; the means at their disposal may fall short of the desired intent; or, in the application of them, in the choice of moral, religious, and intellectual culture to be given to their children, they may commit mistakes dangerous and fatal in proportion to the importance of the subject. But these deficiencies, these shortcomings incidental to the frailty and imperfection of human nature, who is to supply them? I answer, not the State, but Religion, of which the Church is the instrument. Every Government, indeed, really anxious for the welfare of its subjects, both here and, as a really Christian Government ought to be, hereafter, will reasonably be anxious to diffuse the benefits of education, and—especially in a country circumstanced as Ireland unhappily is, where those public sources have been cut off, which here, as in other Catholic lands, once flowed abundantly in aid of private efforts—will so contribute liberally to found schools, or assist those already founded; but here the mission of Government ends. The State has no mission to teach, or to

supervise education. This is the Church's province, aided as she is by the divine light and presence promised to her by her Divine Founder, to the end of ages. She is commissioned to teach all things whatsoever He has commanded her; and therefore she has a divinely granted authority to supervise all education. I am not now claiming for the Church a divine commission to teach the abstract and exact human sciences, or the material arts of civilized life, but I do say that she is divinely appointed to supervise and control all teaching, to see, as the skilful architect does by the use of the square and plumbline, that the edifice constructed of rude materials by the hands of the builder is not at variance with the purpose for which it is designed, or put together on unsound principles of his art—even so, I assert, is the Church commissioned to see that whatever may be the results of human science and of human skill, they shall not be at variance with the correct and unerring standard of divine truth committed to her keeping, or such as to imperil the Christian morality of which she is the guardian; for to the Church alone is confided the sacred deposit of divine, religious and moral truth, and she alone is the authorized expounder of them; and I hence conclude that—considering the multifarious points of contact with divine truth and the practices of Christian morality, of all subjects of human thought, and even material activity and progress—these objects can be studied or pursued safely only under the guidance of the Catholic Church, and that in her commission to teach all truth, and to enforce and guard the practice of the morality of her Divine Founder's Gospel, is involved the supreme authority to control and supervise even secular education.

Nevertheless there are some who, in their spirit of unlimited subserviency to the State, would fain attribute the sovereign right of superintending and controlling education not to the Church, but to the State—to the secular Government of each country;—but I would ask on what grounds? That Governments should foster education, supply funds, when wanted for its encouragement, to aid and promote the culture, both moral and intellectual, of the human mind, I have already shown; that they are competent, too, to exercise a rigid supervision over the proper use and allocation of subsidies granted for such purposes, I admit; but on what principle they claim, or from what source they pretend to derive authority to control or govern, to model or to shape, according to the accidental views of the man who for the time may wield the power of the State, either the intellectual or the moral branch of mental training, I cannot nor ever could dis-

cover. Education implies moral much more than intellectual culture—the training of the will more than the furnishing the understanding of man. However, speaking even of this latter element or constituent part of education—knowledge—of course I do not mean the knowledge of divine truth, for the right to teach this no one that I know of seriously attributes to the powers that rule this world;—but of the teaching of mere human or scientific truth—I am not aware of any special aptitude that a statesman, as such, can be supposed to possess for teaching or cultivating the understandings of others. On the contrary, I always heard it observed that the more devoted a man is to the cultivation of science, the less adapted is he usually found to be for the management of the material concerns which form the care of Government. But it is in supplying moral cultivation, in providing for the training and direction of man's will, that the State is signally and essentially wanting. This office belongs peculiarly to Religion. She discharges it, first, when in the school, to the youthful, as from the Chair of Truth, to society at large her authorized voice expounds and inculcates the sacred principles which determine, the laws which regulate, and the motives which should influence the course and the morality of human actions, principles, laws, and motives, through the diffusion of which the Church has civilized a pagan and a barbarous world, and through forgetfulness of which the boasted material and intellectual civilization of Greece and Rome became that monster of depravity and corruption, described by St. Paul in the first chapter of his Epistle to the Romans. She discharges this office, too, secondly, by that constant application to the concerns of every-day life, of powerful yet delicate influences, in great part sacramental, all sacred—which, ever present in the Catholic system, though never ostentatiously, still less awkwardly, or in an ungainly manner obtruding themselves, are essential to the regulation of the Christian's onward course through life, even as the unintermitting, though, perhaps, to himself unconscious, because almost instinctive and gentle pressure of the skilful steersman's hand is necessary to maintain his vessel's onward progress to her destined haven against the transverse action of the winds and the currents which tend to set her off her course.

But it is alleged that the interests and good order of society demand that the early training of youth should harmonize with the views of those entrusted with the maintenance of public order. If by this is meant, that the teaching of youth in its relations to social duties should harmonize with the grand general principles of Social Ethics which form the basis of society, and which belong to that class of truth of

which the Church is the guardian and the only safe expounder, I admit the statement; but if it be meant that the State, disconnecting itself, both in its ultimate object and daily action, from religion, disdaining, as is now the fashion, the co-operation of religion, much less dependence on and subordination to it, then I not only deny and stigmatize as unsound the statement thus boldly set forward as a principle, but I fearlessly assert that wherever the State has arrogated to itself the control of the education of the people, results of a totally different, and of a most melancholy character, because most fatal to public order and to religion, have ensued. Of the pernicious consequences to religion, which culminated in the blasphemies uttered in the Students' Meeting in Belgium, not two years ago, I need not speak at length; and as to the part played by young men educated in State Universities and schools in revolutionary movements, the experience of all Europe in '48, not to speak of earlier and later periods, abundantly testify to the evil results of State education. Nor,—judging of things by first principles, and by the effect which maxims early inculcated in the minds of youth must produce,—can it be otherwise. For which of the two public instructors, the Church or the State—and which of the two lines of thought inculcated by them, are most likely to succeed in promoting social union, co-operation, and subordination of all classes of society to the common welfare, and obedience to constituted authorities? The Church teaches that all power is from God—she spreads the halo of her consecration around the crowns of kings, and gives her blessing to the inauguration of the chief magistrate of the State, whatever be his title or the form of government, and makes obedience to authority a virtue and a duty, the observance of which is rewarded, its violation punished by God himself. In her code, industry, the necessity of which is a punishment due to sin, is a duty, and the material prosperity which is sometimes the result, a blessing which it is fair to look for, and right to avail oneself of with thankfulness, but so as not to allow the use of it to turn our thoughts away from the bright hopes of a future in which alone true and lasting happiness can be found; so that the less fortunate in this life need not therefore be needlessly dejected or discontented with their lot. How different the feelings, the aspirations which the teaching of the State are calculated to develop! Constituted, as Governments now delight to consider themselves, as the mere expression of the popular will, the State necessarily shuts out from view the most powerful, the only efficacious motive to submission and obedience;—regarding itself as the concentration, so to speak, of all that is perfect in mere human intelligence and

morality, the State must of necessity, if it do not wish to degrade its own origin, inculcate lessons of pride and self-sufficiency;—material good, and what is vaguely called the progress of humanity, are its avowed objects, and therefore it never ceases to foster and to inculcate lessons of, and aspirations after, material comfort, progress, and improvement, the whole drift of which is to make a man believe himself worthy of respect and esteem in proportion as he procures an increase of the things of this world for himself, or places them more easily within reach of society. That I am not drawing a fancy sketch or an imaginary picture, I appeal to you, gentlemen, to testify; conversant, as you are with all the details of the State education provided for our youth in the National schools of this country—the tendency of the entire curriculum of which, is it not, from its commencement to its close, so manifestly in this direction of mere material improvement, that it must strike even the most unobservant to be such as I have described? But I ask is the constant dinning of such views and principles into the minds of men from their early youth, calculated to produce any effect, especially in a country like this where there is such an unequal distribution, brought about too by external agencies, of the goods of life—except that of making men, even as they grow up avaricious and grasping—intent only on material comfort and individual aggrandizement, discontented with the humble parts which are ordinarily allotted to the majority of mankind to play in this world, forgetful of the inevitable inequalities of position and fortune which God's providence has ordained for men, and very much inclined to look upon the possession by others of what is denied to them, as an injustice and a wrong? Immense, therefore, whether for good or ill, is the power of Education, and strange it indeed is, that this immense and uncontrollable power should be—in the name, too, of the interests of society and good order—ascribed to the State, whose natural tendency, when separated and independent of religion, is to make so bad a use of it.

But Liberty, too, stranger still to say, is invoked as justifying the absorption by the State of the control and management of this most powerful agency. Liberty, however, as understood in Catholic times—as contended for by the Catholic Church—does not mean the concentration of every description of authority and influence in the hands of the State, even were it to be what so-called popular Governments never have been, the true exponent of the popular voice; on the contrary, Liberty appears to have signified the least possible amount of interference on the part of the State with each one's rights and privileges, consistent with the free enjoyment of similar rights and privileges by all other members of the social body. Above all, it implied a total absence of interference with each man's conscientious duties. It

was this stand made by the Christian religion for the liberty and rights of the individual which formed—as is so well explained by the celebrated publicist, Balmez, in his immortal work upon the comparative influence of Protestantism and Catholicism upon modern civilization—the principal characteristic of Christian civilization, and distinguished it from the social system of Paganism, where each individual and all rights were absorbed and swallowed up by the ideal personality of the State. This principle, which I may call that of non-interference, is admitted now as the most successful means of advancing all other interests. The system of free trade is extolled as the only one under which commerce can prosper. The free and unrestricted agencies of economic science are looked upon as the best means even of feeding the hungry when in a state of starvation. In politics, also, the practice of non-intervention is elevated into a principle, not perhaps always the most moral and upright, but at least the safest, and for those who care only for self, the most prudent rule. I cannot agree in all this; but without raising questions on matters upon which those against whom my observations are directed, would probably refuse to accept my judgment, I may ask them, if only for consistency's sake, to extend these principles to the important matter of Education. If we are to have free trade for the benefit of commerce—if Governments are to refuse to aid in great public calamities, or to provide for the miseries of the poor, lest, as they say, by interference they should disturb the free and beneficial action of social causes, then I say we are entitled, too, to Freedom of Education, and hence not only in the name of religion, whose rights are invaded—of parents, whose consciences are impeded in the conscientious discharge of their duties to their children, but in the name, too, of liberty, I protest, in the words of the resolution, against every effort of the State to force upon Catholics any system of education restrictive of the authority of the Church, or inimical to the interests of Catholic parents, whose right and duty it is to impart a religious education to their children. Your Eminence, my Lord Bishop, and Gentlemen, regretting still that the resolution has not fallen into abler hands, I have the honour to propose it for your adoption.

The Venerable Archdeacon DUNNE, P.P., Castledermott, seconded the resolution. He said—My Lord Cardinal, the resolution which I have the honour to second announces truths that have been perpetually upheld since the establishment of the Church of Christ. One is that the Church is vested with

authority ; another that no Government is justified in forcing, no matter how plausible its professions, a system of education restrictive of what the Church deems her rights, and inimical to the interests of Catholic parents, whose right and duty it is to impart to their children a Catholic education. These truths can be supported by many and the most convincing arguments, as you have already heard. You, my Lord Cardinal, not only now, but at all times, like a true sentinel on the watch-towers, have proclaimed this indisputable right of the Church. Our Ecclesiastical Record has advanced irrefragable proofs on this head, only echoing the decrees of our National Council of Thurles.

It is by authority heaven and earth are ruled. When that is attempted to be shaken off in any sphere of the universe, all must become disorder and ruin. When that was disregarded in the Garden of Eden, then appeared the necessity of some powerful light to enlighten every man that afterwards came into the world. Ever since our first and erring mother tasted of the forbidden fruit of the tree of knowledge, we have been in degradation. Whether we call this world a banishment, as Job calls it, or a vale of tears, as the Church describes it, mankind feels the penalty of that fall. By it we were born in darkness—banished children of Eve. The human mind, thus eclipsed in its dawn by the indulgences of passion, verged from age to age to a state of total unacquaintance with the Author of its existence. Pride, avarice, cruelty, and oppression wanted but success to distinguish their agents. The dictates of the natural law, unheard or forgotten amid the tumult of passion, were too weak to resist the torrent of corruption, and man, left without an authoritative guide—man, the favourite production of the wisdom and power of his God, transferred the supreme homage to the perishable works of his own hands. Abandoned and forlorn he mistook the paths of folly and impiety for those of sanctity and peace. He confounded justice with injustice, the impiety of superstition with the worship of his God. Thus wandering in the regions of the shadow of death, the shameless victim of every evil propensity, he was unable to conceive a simple thought that could tend in the least degree to his eternal welfare. But the goodness of God, surpassing man's depravity, sent forth the Orient from on high, which was to dispel to the end of time the darkness that enveloped our fallen nature.

If, my Lord Cardinal, the fallen monuments of the Pagan Institutes which you have often witnessed, if they bear on record the starless night of its melancholy reign, the benefits that succeeded, and still accompany the diffusion of religious teaching in every age, since the Church received her divine commission, no less significantly point out the efficacy of its

saving influence. The contest which the power of darkness so long maintained against that of light now found its termination, when with divine authority it was announced—"All power is given to me in heaven and on earth; going, therefore, teach ye all nations, baptizing them in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost; teaching them to observe all things whatsoever I have commanded you: and behold I am with you all days, even to the consummation of the world." This was the commission given by the great Lawgiver immediately before his departure from the earth. The Church, with her Head, has ever exercised that power. To it the great lights in the early and in the modern times—from the Gregories and the Basils, to the days of Thomas of Aquin and Fenelon—have submitted, and that submission was given in their pursuit of secular education.

Yet some have said that secular education, being a mere temporal matter, is outside the province and control of the Church. It is not so. Education, of whatever kind, influences more or less men's faith and morals. The faith and morals of men are not confided in the divine commission to the State. On the contrary, the Church with her Pontiffs at all times exercised this power, sometimes aided by the State, as they should be, and often opposed by emperors and kings for their own statecraft. A parent, and a Catholic parent no less than any other, has primarily the right to educate. When he brings his child to be enrolled at baptism in the Church, he puts that child under the control of the Catholic Church, under which he and his child are placed by Almighty God. The Church has a positive and an indispensable right, independent of all earthly power, to teach truth, to watch over that truth, especially in the minds of youth, and to correct error. As, then, the civil power has not received the right to educate, it being primarily a domestic function, the State should protect and foster the peaceful enjoyment of those rights. It is the province of any wise Government to cherish the growth of sound knowledge. This should be a grateful duty towards subjects, upon whom, from the very principles of their religion, obedience to the laws is inculcated. This duty is drawn from the example of Him, who, before his birth, subjected himself to the temporal edict of Augustus, and who himself declared—"Render to Cæsar the things that are Cæsar's." At all times the Church encouraged learning and the sciences; she never, as is continued to be asserted, was opposed to enlightenment—no matter what this or the other man may say—like to Lord Russell—that she enslaves the mind and clouds the understanding—or Mr. Lowe, that the Government will assist education by its own ideas of State policy, and can disregard

opinions appealing to an authority which they openly set at defiance. In this instance it is the State that sets at defiance what we believe to be a divine authority to watch over that which we hold to be most dear.

It has recently been declared by the Holy See, "that it is next to impossible to discover circumstances which would allow Catholics, without sin, to attend non-Catholic universities." It has repeatedly declared that those institutions are dangerous to the faith and morals of students. Do we not know, my Lord Cardinal, the false teaching that, alas! is prevalent outside the Church now-a-days? A religion of naturalism, of materialism, is propagated. The material world is worshipped. The sensual world is everything. God is disregarded: hence he is unknown, not thought of, and his revelation ignored. No, my Lord, till time shall be no more, the Catholic Church will denounce and abhor such teaching. She will tell her children the necessity of restraining both the will and the intellect in due subjection, and to refer all, whatsoever they do, to the honour of the Supreme Ruler of all. Let man, therefore, gifted as he is by the bounty of his God, explore the wide extent of creation. Let the study of nature occupy and engross his most fixed attention. He may trace the revolution of the shining orbs, and number the stars of the firmament of heaven: however advanced in every art, and illumined by the light of every science, should he pause here in his research, there is something still requisite to dignify his knowledge, and to render it truly profitable; and this is contained in the simple and eloquent lesson conveyed by the Apostle: "Whether you eat or whether you drink, or whatsoever you do, do all for the honour and glory of God, and thus it will lead to life eternal." God forbid, then, we should ever ignore that divine authority that must always direct us in every pursuit after knowledge, and every hour guide our studies.

Look to the sad state of those countries in early and in modern times, that have thrown off that restraint and despised that authority. Look to the sad fall of the once flourishing churches of Africa and of Asia. Where now are the churches of Ephesus, of Antioch, of Alexandria, founded by the Apostles themselves—the light of whose faith and doctrine once blazed with meridian splendour? There, now, in melancholy silence, Religion mourns her altars overturned—the subversion of her temples—the total extinction of the blessings of Christianity. They fell, from the corruption of their morals, to the loss of their glory, to the loss of their faith, to the loss of their God; and they have fallen with some nations nearer home, perhaps never again to rise from the tomb of error and infidelity. Let us, then, struggle and contend for a free

Catholic education, under the guidance of those invested with authority to teach. A wise Government will find that its best subjects will be those thus educated. It should aid, and it can adopt measures that the aid given be strictly applied. Truth, under our free constitution, will ultimately triumph. *Magna est veritas et prævalebit.* Then, my Lord Cardinal, we may look forward to the day when our places of learning, and science, and religion, will emulate the Golden days of Ireland, when her places of learning, her colleges and seminaries, were the great seats of knowledge and piety in Europe. This we have testified to by Venerable Bede, when, writing of Ireland in the eighth century, he says that many noble English and others of inferior rank withdrew to Ireland to cultivate letters or to lead lives of greater sanctity; some became monks, others attended the lectures of celebrated teachers—these the Irish cheerfully received and supplied, without any recompense, with food, with books, and with instruction. This is also testified by Alcuin, when writing of Willibrord, a Northumbrian, afterwards Archbishop of Utrecht, a celebrated missioner amongst the Frisians in the eighth century. "When," says this writer, "Willibrord arrived at the age of twenty, he became inflamed with a desire of stricter life and with a love of visiting foreign countries; and because he heard that learning flourished greatly in Ireland, he withdrew thither, and spent twelve years there, treasuring up virtue and knowledge, to enable him to become the teacher of many nations." This lamp of learning and piety will again blaze forth, and Ireland will still be, my Lord and Very Rev. Friends, the harbinger of good tidings to other countries; and will, we trust, always be aiding in the great commission of teaching "all nations to the end of time."

The Very Rev. Monsignor WOODLOCK, Rector, Catholic University, moved the next resolution, as follows:—

"That, asserting the right of Catholics to educational equality with their Protestant fellow-countrymen, we protest against the monopoly of higher education enjoyed by existing Universities, the Royal and Endowed Schools, and other such institutions, so long and so unjustly maintained to perpetuate Protestant ascendency in this country."

May it please your Eminence, my Lords, and Gentlemen, I have been asked to propose the third resolution. I feel no little difficulty, my Lord Cardinal and Gentlemen, in addressing this learned assembly on such a subject; for I see around me many more competent to do so than I am—many who have devoted years and great study to the full investigation of this subject—many who have spent a long time at this great work of education. But the position in which I am placed in

our Irish Catholic University will, I hope, plead my apology for asking you to bear with me while I trace for you the leading features of this important question, as sketched in the resolution I have just read.

That resolution seems to be made up of two points. First, it asserts our right as Catholics to educational equality with our Protestant fellow-countrymen. Secondly, it declares in what way, as far as higher education is concerned, that right has long been and is still infringed upon.

And first, we assert our right to educational equality with our fellow-countrymen of other religious denominations. We do not want to curtail the rights of any Irishman, but we assert our own rights, and those rights we will not surrender. And what are those rights? We all know that eternal principle of distributive justice—that fundamental principle given by Almighty Justice itself for the guidance of those who have been placed to rule the earth. We know that even as commutative justice regulates the duties of man to his fellow-man, so also distributive justice obliges the prince and his ministers to distribute justly and fairly the public advantages and privileges among all the members of the commonwealth. Now, we assert the right of the Catholic body in Ireland to have this principle applied to them as regards the advantages and privileges attached to education.

Again, what is that vaunted principle of the nineteenth century, the principle of civil and religious liberty, of which those who deny us our rights talk so much, and seem to understand so little? It is no other than this—that civil disabilities are not to be imposed for religious opinions. Now, I ask, is not this principle violated, and outrageously violated, as long as the State enters into the sanctuary of the family, and tells the Catholic parent that there are privileges and advantages, social, pecuniary, and others, which he or his children cannot enjoy, as long as he believes and acts upon certain religious opinions—opinions which most intimately concern the service he owes to his Maker; for they regard the manner in which he, as a parent, is to discharge that most important duty of bringing up his offspring in the love and service of his and their God? And is it now, nearly forty years after Emancipation, that we are called upon to vindicate this principle? What mean the words with which that famous Act of Parliament commences—that charter of our rights wrested by our Liberator, O'Connell, from an unwilling monarch and a reluctant Parliament:—"Whereas, by various Acts of Parliament, certain restraints are imposed on the Roman Catholic subjects of his Majesty, to which other subjects of his Majesty are not liable; and whereas it is expedient that such restraints and

disabilities shall be from henceforth discontinued." Yes, we assert our right to have imposed upon us no restraints in education to which our fellow-subjects are not liable; we declare, in the words I have just quoted, that it is expedient that "*such restraints and disabilities*" in education, as well as in other respects, "*shall be from henceforth discontinued.*" We assert our right that, from henceforth, no honour, no emolument, no advantage, shall be attainable through Protestant or non-Catholic education, which may not be attained through education on purely Catholic principles.

But I may be told that Catholicity is an aggressive religion, that we have no right to these privileges; that we are very well off to be tolerated at all, for that this is a Protestant empire.

It is true England is Protestant, but Ireland is a Catholic kingdom; and if this principle is to be urged—if Irish Catholics, because they are Catholics, are not to have equal rights with their Protestant fellow-subjects—then, I will say to our rulers, why have you Catholic subjects at all? Why do you not follow up the acts of bygone times, and carry us off in a body to Barbadoes and your other West Indian possessions? Why not exterminate our race by fire and sword?

But this is not the present policy of our rulers—a policy which, in the past, was as futile as it was inhuman. Our great national ecclesiastical college proves that more wise and more lenient counsels now prevail. Nay, more; the world, with one accord, now exclaims against the inconsistency of a Protestant Government which would put forward such principles. I say a Protestant Government, whose starting point, in religious opinions, is, that in such matters it is every man's indefeasible right to judge for himself.

But Catholics, we are told, are a priest-ridden people, and all this clamour is but an effort made by us, priests, to enslave our flocks. If, by this unseemly epithet, applied to Catholics, the enemies of our just rights mean to assert that our flocks admit the priestly office of teaching under due subjection to our bishops and the Sovereign Pontiff, they have good reason to say that our faithful people know the voice of their pastors, and obey them in all things appertaining to their spiritual interests. This is our religion, and Irish Catholics know their religion and follow its dictates. They know, too, who their priests are: to each one of them, they know, the words of the Apostle may be applied, "*ex hominibus assumptus, pro hominibus constituitur in iis quæ sunt ad Deum.*" Chosen by God from their own ranks, no strange race, no alien body; of their own flesh and blood, children of the same fathers, the Catholic priests in Ireland, as elsewhere, seek not to domineer over the

people, but to lead them to their Maker. Nay, more; the Catholic people, and, above all, our Irish Catholic people, know full well that, far from encroaching on their rights, the Church is the great protectress of those rights, and especially their defender against the tyrannical attempts of Governments and servile Erastians, who would fain deprive the Catholic parent of the right he has received from the Creator to give a religious education to his children. In fine, those who speak so much of the desire of the Church to control education, seem to forget that we never hear this objection urged against the Protestant University, and the many Protestant schools and colleges, whose heads and managers are clergymen of the Established Church. Or is it that even our enemies, while admitting the sacred character of the Catholic priest, tacitly reject all sacredness in the Orders of their own Church?

I now pass to the second part of the resolution entrusted to me. It is a protest against the existing monopoly of higher education in Ireland. What is that monopoly?

First, we have Trinity College, or the Protestant University of Dublin. Had the Government of the country granted, and did it maintain privileges in no educational institution in this country, we might justly accuse it of a grave omission of duty; but what shall we say when privileges and advantages of all kinds are given in profusion to some institutions, while the smallest boon, the least recognition, is denied to others, merely because they are Catholic? To the Protestant University of Dublin landed property has been granted to the extent of 199,573 acres, or about the one-hundredth part of the whole of Ireland. Besides the large sums spent on the edifices originally, the Irish Parliament voted, between the years 1690 and 1787, nearly £100,000 in extraordinary grants, for the extension, &c., of the buildings. The College has, likewise, the right of presentation to twenty-one benefices, and there is scarcely a county in Ireland which has not one or more schools or colleges under the name of Endowed schools, Royal schools, Diocesan schools, or Erasmus Smith's schools, institutions which are spread over the land like a network of Protestant education, and are all subsidiary to the great Protestant University of Dublin.

The teaching of the institution is thoroughly Protestant; it is grounded upon that religion. Far from admitting in the least the influence of Catholicity, the whole atmosphere of the place—"*aura loci*" (to use the words of the letter of Propaganda, quoted by your Eminence)—is impregnated with Protestantism. Its staff is Protestant; its books are Protestant; its traditions are Protestant and anti-Catholic; and during the four most precious, and, at the same time, most dangerous

years of life, every student who frequents the halls of Trinity College is practically taught to reverence and pay intellectual homage to everything Protestant, and to ignore, if not to despise, all that can reflect glory on the Catholic Church.

The injustice to Catholics of leaving Trinity College the only University in Ireland was so great, that the Queen's Colleges and Queen's University were founded for the purpose, it was asserted, of remedying the crying evil. But the remedy was, in some measure, worse than the disease. The Catholics of Ireland asked for bread, and they were given a stone. The Queen's Colleges were justly condemned by the Church as gravely and essentially dangerous to faith and morals; and the late Sir Robert Inglis declared them to be a "gigantic scheme of godless education." As far as the Catholics of Ireland are concerned, they are a failure, and only a few have been found to despise the warnings of religion, and yield to the pressure of necessity, or to the abundant allurements held out to tempt Catholics to their lecture-halls.

What wonder, then, that the following sentences should be found in a Protestant journal of this city upon yesterday! Public report attributes them to a Fellow of Trinity College:—

"It is useless and only a mockery to say that Roman Catholics are or ought to be contented with their present position as regards university education. Would Church of England parents bear to be told that they must send their sons to the Queen's Colleges or to a university, if such existed, which was the Roman Catholic analogue to Trinity College? Protestants are justly proud of the liberal spirit that characterizes their own University; and it is quite true that proselytism is unknown within its walls." (Is it true?) "But Catholics want something more in the education of their children than the mere absence of proselytism. They want a positive religious instruction, and a positive religious supervision, similar to that which Protestants of the Established Church have in Trinity College. Would Irish Protestants send their sons to a Catholic University, no matter how liberal might be its spirit, or how complete might be the immunity of its Protestant students from the danger of proselytism? Would not the facts that its visitor was a Roman Catholic cardinal; that all its fellows and professors were Catholics; that the great majority of them were Catholic priests"—(this is not the case in our Catholic University)—"that the curriculum was constructed on Roman Catholic principles, and inclusive of the lights of the Roman Church; and that the traditions of the institution and its *genius loci* were distinctly Catholic—be quite sufficient to exclude Protestant students? Some journalists are so blind as not to see that facts like these are equally strong when the words

Catholic and Protestant are interchanged, and they contend that 'the absence of any agitation on the part of the Catholic laity, is a sufficient proof that these are quite contented with the present system.' We think that the mere fact that the question of university education, a question usually so unobtrusive and subaltern in the world of politics, should have attained its present position in Parliament and the press, and in the conversation of educated men, is abundant proof that the Catholic body, lay as well as clerical, is discontented with present arrangements. The subscriptions that have been made toward the foundation of the Catholic University, are quite sufficient, in the existing circumstances of the Catholic laity, to attest their desire for such an institution. The agitation, we admit, is not violent or noisy; but are no concessions to be made except to noise and violence? We used to hear that the English working-classes did not desire representation in Parliament. But it has turned out that their desire for it was strong enough to make a Conservative Government take 'a leap in the dark,' and a reluctant Parliament drift helplessly into household suffrage. University reform is precisely one of those questions which it is desirable to approach in a calm and temperate spirit, and not under the goad of vulgar demagogueism and ignorant clamour. What we do now, we can do deliberately, and for the sake of learning and education. But it is unpleasant to forecast what may be done, if we resist all concession till the cry arises, *Fiat justitia, ruat cœlum.* The *status quo*, then, is impossible, or, at least, highly dangerous. The question cannot be left as it is."

But we are told that the Protestant University and the Protestant schools and colleges I have referred to are of old foundation; that, therefore, they cannot be disturbed. The older they are, I reply, the greater the necessity for remedying the evil. Surely, the injustice has lasted long enough; it is time to give justice to Irish Catholics. If Protestants want such institutions, let them have them as far as they are necessary; but Catholics must have the same privileges. You must level up in education, if you will not have others level down. But in your projects for the educational amelioration of our country, do not commit again the mistake you made in creating the Queen's Colleges. Do not, when we ask for food, give us a scorpion to sting us.

My Lords and Gentlemen, some of you are not aware that, even as I speak, some of these dangers—shall I call them present or prospective?—are not, perhaps, as distant as might be expected. A Royal College of Science has been established in this city, and Scotch and English Protestants have been set to teach in it, and English Protestant pupils have been lured by

exhibitions to its otherwise empty halls. Let us hope that this scheme is not another phase of the long and varied effort to force upon our Catholic people Protestant teaching, or at any rate its equivalent, un-Catholic education! Let us hope that this new institution, unsought for, except by those who are interested in maintaining the educational ascendency of the Established Church, is not a new device for maintaining that fell purpose! In fine, let us hope that the public money will not be squandered, and, what is much worse, a source of new divisions and heartburnings created, by attempting to force upon our Catholic city an infidel college in the new Royal College of Science!

But we are told that our people do not care for this question. The Protestant journalist whom I have quoted has ably answered this objection. I shall add nothing to his words except the following brief remarks: Our enemies care for it; and "*fas est et ab hoste doceri.*" Those half-ignorant Catholics, who declaim against the Church's efforts to secure pure education in the higher branches, know the value of the principle at stake, for they are the first to give their own children a thoroughly religious education. In fine, all classes of our Catholic people prize, as they ought, the blessings of Catholic education, for they know full well that it is the question of the future; that upon the solution of the problem now before us depends the issue, whether our dear old land is to remain for ever what she has been for ages—Catholic Ireland. Other questions may be more urgent; a father, who sees his children famishing before his eyes, must first find bread for them; but still, if once the wolf is driven from the door, his next thought for his offspring surely is, how he can bring them up so as best to secure their welfare here and hereafter by a religious education.

I conclude: our Catholic fathers have handed down to us a glorious name; let us transmit it unsullied to those who are to follow us. This we cannot do unless by securing for them Catholic education in all its branches. Too long have we been helots in our own land; aliens in religion have maintained over us an unholy educational ascendency. Let us not rest—let us encourage our people not to rest—let us urge on our bishops and brother priests throughout Ireland not to rest—till every vestige of ascendency is swept away, and in particular every vestige of that ascendency which gives Protestants educational advantages over Catholics, and thus tends to transmit to future generations the inequalities so long and so unjustly maintained in this country.

The Very Rev. Monsignor MORAN seconded the resolution. He said—It needs but little eloquence to commend to your

approbation the resolution which I have been requested to second. This resolution protests against an anomaly unparalleled in history—the anomaly of a Protestant University, and other educational establishments, enriched and endowed with the spoils of Catholic property, and, nevertheless, upheld by the State as national institutions among a Catholic people. Yes, Ireland is a Catholic nation, but it is a Catholic nation which for three centuries has been a prey to a Protestant ascendency, by whose baneful influence its energies have been blighted, its resources exhausted, its every effort marred to develop national wealth, and to secure for our people the enjoyment of religious education and the blessings of peace. It was in support of such an ascendency that the Protestant institutions, to which this resolution refers, were established in this island; it is in support of it that they are upheld amongst us; and still we are to be told that they are national institutions, a blessing and a boon to our Catholic people.

At the commencement of the Reformation period, despite the ravages of long-continued wars, there were innumerable religious and educational establishments in this country, diffusing around them the blessings of faith, and preserving a remnant of civilization in our island. All these were swept away by a ruthless hand, and their possessions and lands were confiscated. Yet, that property was not held from the Crown, neither was it derived from royal grant or charter; it was private property, to which the State had no other claim than that of the highwayman to the purse of the plundered traveller, or the revolutionary Garibaldian hordes to the vineyards of Mentana. Still it was violently seized on and handed over to court favorites, or to institutions in which our religion was proscribed, and whose avowed aim it was to root out the Catholic faith from the hearts of our people.

You will ask, was Trinity College enriched with such religious spoils? Was it founded on that principle of hostility to our creed which I have commemorated? History answers in the affirmative.

For four centuries the clergy and people of Ireland had asked in vain to have a university established in this island. During that period eleven universities had sprung into existence at the touch of the Roman Pontiff in Italy, and no fewer than fifty-five similar institutions had been founded in other countries of Europe; yet, the petition of Ireland remained unheeded by the English monarch. At length, however, the wished-for boon was to be granted. The deputies and viceroys of Queen Elizabeth repeatedly complained that no learned men could be found to preach the new tenets of Protes-

tantism, and that there were not sufficient endowments in the country to attract from England and elsewhere such men as might give weight to the assault on Catholic doctrines. Therefore was it decreed that a university should be founded, as a centre for the genius and talent of Protestantism, a rallying point for all who might wish to assail the Catholic Church, and a source of emolument to those who would abandon the faith of their fathers. The illustrious Peter Lombard, Archbishop of Armagh, writing a few years after the establishment of this university, thus describes its origin :—"It was well known that the Irish revered men of learning and eloquence; it was therefore resolved, the more effectually to inculcate the royal tenets, to send to Ireland some ministers who were remarkable in England and Scotland for their ability and eloquence . . . . . To provide instruction for the nation, and to display a greater earnestness in its regard than had hitherto been shown, for often had the erection of a university been in vain solicited from the crown, a most ample and splendid college was erected a few years ago in the vicinity of Dublin by royal decree, but at the expense of the inhabitants, in which all liberal arts are to be taught solely by heretical teachers. As such heretical masters, however, could not be had in Ireland, they were sent thither from England; and, the better to establish and propagate their tenets, they received the mission to preach the Protestant doctrines in Dublin, and were commanded, moreover, to exact the oath of the Queen's supremacy in religious matters from all the students whom they admitted to instruction."

The very site on which the Elizabethan University was erected was religious property confiscated in the reign of Elizabeth's royal father. It comprised the Priory of All-Hallows and a portion of the famous Augustinian Nunnery, the foundations of which were traced four centuries before by the great Archbishop of Armagh, St. Malachy. This property was seized and handed over to the citizens of Dublin by Henry VIII. The roofs and a portion of the walls were subsequently appropriated to repair the royal castle within the city; and now Adam Loftus petitioned to have "these ruinous buildings and their meadows" set aside for a nursery of Protestant learning. His petition was granted, and the royal charter was issued in 1592, granting full university privileges to this new institution; and we may judge of the spirit which pervaded it from the fact, that in 1626 its great patrons and most distinguished alumni solemnly avowed it to be their teaching that it was *a grievous sin* to grant any toleration to Popery.* Dr.

* Declaration of Protestant bishops, assembled at Usher's house, in Dublin, 26th November, 1626.

Matthews, Archbishop of Dublin, bitterly lamented the new phase of persecution ushered in by the Protestant University, and thus wrote to the Holy See:—"It is interdicted to Catholics to teach school either in public or in private; on the other hand, heretical masters are hired in every diocese, and paid from the revenues of some of our ancient benefices, to pervert our youth and to imbue them with heresy. In fact, the heretics have obstructed every avenue by which our youth could receive instruction in this kingdom; and, by severe penalties and rigorous inquisitions, they seek to render it impossible for any Catholic teacher to remain amongst us—and, having created a University in the city of Dublin, they employ every artifice to attract our children to its schools, and indeed they could not possibly devise any scheme more iniquitous than this, thus to corrupt our youth."

The persecuted Church of Ireland, however, was nobly avenged on its assailants. The learned Scotch and English preachers returned home with empty hands, declaring that the harvest was not yet ripe. Of one in particular we know that he was so struck with the fervent piety and devoted attachment of our people to the Catholic faith, that he renounced heresy, and soon after had the privilege of expiating his faults by laying down his life for the faith at Tyburn. This was the illustrious Jesuit martyr, Father Campion. The professors, too, who went about, as was then the custom, preaching in the public streets, were received everywhere with raillery and insult, till at length the magistrates, fearing a general tumult, imposed silence on the preachers; and as to the students, Peter Lombard tells us, that "they chose to remain in ignorance, retaining the integrity of their faith, rather than with literature to imbibe the fatal corruption of heresy." And, I may add, that Catholic faith avenged itself too, of him who was the brightest ornament of Trinity's schools, as he had been the champion of its bigotry in his earlier years, Dr. James Usher, who, before the close of his eventful life, when reduced to poverty and abandoned by his former friends, wrote to the Papal Nuncio, asking to be restored to the bosom of Holy Church, and offering to bear with him his manuscripts and library to Rome.

What shall I say of the many endowments with which the University was enriched, to assail the Catholic Church, and to be a bulwark of Protestantism? A large share in the lands of Desmond, in Munster, as of those of O'Donnell and O'Neill, in Ulster, was granted to it. The estates of O'Sullivan Bear, M'Mahon, and others, shared the same fate; and, indeed, it may be justly said, that from the time of its foundation to that

of Oliver Cromwell, no confiscation was made in Ireland, whether on plea of religion or of treason—whether exacted as fines or surrendered by pliant jurors, of which a large portion was not awarded to the University; and thus was gradually formed that immense property of about 200,000 acres, which still enriches it. And yet this was not all. Nineteen old Irish benefices were attached to it by James the First, the gross revenue of which is at the present day more than £25,000 a-year; and twelve other benefices have since been added. In 1629, a ray of toleration dawned upon the suffering Church of Ireland. Charles the First stood in need of supplies from this island, and on the promise of the so-called Graces, £120,000 were granted to him. Relying on the royal promise, the Catholics opened an University in this city. Its halls were befittingly adorned, and even Borlase calls it *a fair collegiate building*. The English monarch, however, took the £120,000, and then a plea was found for refusing the promised toleration. The opening of a Catholic University was declared to be an act of unparalleled presumption. It was ordered to be confiscated without delay, and with its appendages was handed over to swell the endowments of Trinity College. Two mass-houses, as they were called, in Bridge-street, were seized at the same time by the agents of the Government, and were annexed in like manner by the Protestant University. Thirty scholarships were at this time set aside for the Irish language; but it was expressly provided that whilst engaged in the study of Irish, the minds of the youths should be imbued with Protestantism. As years rolled on new emoluments were added to the store of this favoured institution, till, at the present day, its gross annual income may be estimated at about £150,000 a-year. Its premiums alone amount to more than £10,000 per annum; its building fund received from the Irish Parliament, during the interval from William the Third to the close of the last century, the sum of £75,000; and, as we learn from Heron's "Constitutional History," the enlargement of the University franchise, in 1832, brought in ten years an addition to the emoluments of its governing body of £48,000.

The Erasmus Smith donations are often spoken of as a proof that Trinity College owes its wealth to private munificence, and not to unjust confiscations. But history tells us some stubborn tales. It teaches us that Erasmus Smith was one of the so-called adventurers in Cromwell's time, and that by his peculiar skill he secured to himself, in various ways, immense estates in several parts of the country, to the extent of many thousand acres. On the restoration of Charles II., his claim to these lands was found to be unjust; yet he successfully

bartered with the Crown for a royal patent,* engaging, on his part, to found some grammar schools, and to add to the endowments of Trinity College to the amount of about £8,000 a-year. Thus the plundered Irish Catholics and Royalists were allowed to clamour unheeded for the estates of which they had been unjustly despoiled, whilst the University received new funds to Protestantize our island.

During all this time, Trinity College never relaxed its efforts to implant a Protestant ascendency amongst us. Each revision of its rules seemed to bring more clearly into light its hostility to Catholic faith, and to it belongs the unenviable boast of having enacted, in the nineteenth century (in 1808), the last penal law against the Catholics of Ireland. Yet all its efforts were unavailing to root out Catholicity from our people. In the reign of Charles I., the Provost of Trinity College declared that "the island was almost entirely Popish, and its Protestant establishment had as little effect upon the religion of the people, as a chariot lashed upon the deck of a ship had in directing the vessel's course;" and a hundred years later, Primate Boulter was forced to make a similar confession. Some students, indeed, allured by its rich prizes, were entrapped within its walls; but their perversion had no effect upon the nation. The University, as Mr. Heron writes, was managed on the principle of a net. All Catholics were permitted to enter; the smaller fry, the lesser talents, were allowed to escape, but the good fish were detained for ever: and he adds, that such perversions *still frequently happen*, but that formerly they were *far more numerous*. There are, of course, exceptions to every rule, even as in shipwreck some one may, by a benign Providence, be saved, perhaps not through any exertions of his own, but through the prayers of some watchful angel that intercedes for him; but, as a rule, the Catholics of talent who entered the halls of Trinity College, came forth traitors to their faith and hostile to the interests of their country. "When Greece," says an eloquent writer, "laboured beneath the Turkish tyranny, one badge of slavery, one practice of inhuman policy, roused the deepest hatred in Grecian manly hearts, and excited the keenest pangs in the breasts of Grecian mothers. The agents of the Sultan yearly kidnapped the strongest and most healthful of the male infants of the Greeks, and educated them to be the Janissaries

* From the MS. "Survey and Distribution of the County Tipperary after the Rebellion of 1641, pursuant to the Act of Settlement, 1663," preserved in the Ep. Archiv. Cashel, we learn that, in that county alone, the estates granted to Erasmus Smith embraced more than *thirteen thousand seven hundred acres.*

of the Ottoman power, to fight the battles of despotism, and imbue their swords in the life-blood of their kindred. In like manner Trinity College has existed as a gigantic trap to catch young Catholics of rising talent, and array them against their ancestral religion; whilst to their country it has ever been the most bitter thought, that from her own breast was drawn the strength thus used for her oppression."

Thus, in its foundation, in its history, in the endowments with which it was enriched, the University of Dublin was destined to combat Catholic faith and to uphold Protestant ascendency in this country. And as it was for the past, so it is at the present day. I speak not of some noble exceptions amongst its Fellows, whose liberality reflects credit on the country which gave them birth; but I speak of it as an institution, and as such it is a main element of Protestant ascendency, hostile to our faith and to the best interests of Ireland. On its threshold should be inscribed the poet's words—

> "Per me si va nella citta dolente,
> Per me si va tra la perduta gente.
> . . . . . .
> Lasciate ogni speranza voi che'ntrate."

The very site on which it stands, the very stones of its edifices, raise their warning voice and tell the Catholic youth that would frequent its halls, to beware of inheriting the malediction of those who despoil the sanctuary of Christ.

As an instance of the subsidiary schools which were established throughout the country to aid Trinity College in Protestantizing our people, I may mention the Charter Schools. It was in 1733 that they were founded. All the Protestant archbishops and bishops, all the nobility and gentry, the Rodens and Beresfords of that day, petitioned the King that such schools should be founded for the special purpose of proselytism. Primate Boulter, who headed this memorial, and who at the time ruled both Church and State in Ireland, writing to an English prelate, thus detailed the motives which impelled them to present that petition—"The great number of Papists in this country, and the obstinacy with which they adhere to their own religion, occasions our trying what may be done with their children to bring them over to our Church. I can assure you that the Papists are here so numerous, that it highly concerns us in point of interest to try all possible means to bring them and theirs over to our religion; and one of the likeliest methods we can think of is, if possible, instructing and converting the young generation; for instead of converting those that are adult, we are daily losing many of our meaner people, who go

off to Popery."* Thus, it was not through any desire to diffuse the blessings of education among our people, that these schools were petitioned for; on the contrary, at that very time the penal enactments were enforced with the greatest rigour. It was penal for an Irish youth to seek for education abroad; it was penal to keep any Catholic school at home, and it was equally penal to frequent such a school. The new system was nothing more than an extension of the proselytizing machinery, and its management was wholly entrusted to the prelates of the Established Church. These schools were for one hundred years maintained at the national expense, and on an average they received about £80,000 a-year.

It is not necessary to enter into the details of the system of proselytism pursued in these schools; I will rather ask, What were the fruits which they produced? The Parliamentary Reports of 1825 present abundant authentic information on this head. The supply of Catholic youths, we are told, was not so numerous as had been hoped for, and hence nurseries were established, that is, schools for foundlings and for children one of whose parents was Catholic, that thus they might recruit the ranks of the Charter Schools. Still, despite every effort to sustain them, they proved to be a failure. Like the Model Schools and Queen's Colleges of the present day, they bore with them the curse of the Irish people, and they withered and decayed, no one could well say why. The celebrated philanthropist, Howard, visited them in 1764, and again in 1767, and laid the result of his observations before the Parliamentary Committee. He declared that the children in the Charter Schools were "ill-fed, ill-taught, sickly, pale, miserable objects, a disgrace to all society." Another inspector, Sir J. Fitzpatrick, twenty years later (1786-7), reports on twenty-eight Charter Schools which he had visited, "that the school-rooms were dilapidated and dirty, and that the children were barbarously treated by their masters—puny, filthy, ill-clothed, without linen, and indecent to look upon." In 1803, Protestant children had to be admitted into these schools, as Catholics could no longer be induced to enter them; yet even so, they bore with them the curse of barrenness, and failed to bless the country with any fruit. The official reports continue to disclose a most lamentable state of things. As late as 1817, we are told that learning and religion were wholly neglected, and the children were in hunger, nakedness, filth, and ignorance.

Such is briefly the history of these schools, as presented by the Parliamentary Commissioners in 1825; and I have dwelt

* Letters, vol. ii. p. 9.

on it somewhat in detail, as an instance of the results which may be hoped for from institutions, no matter what may be their wealth, which are founded to sustain Protestant ascendency in this country, and to wage a deadly war against the Catholic faith. So long as the memory of these schools remains, they shall justify the protest of Catholics against every scheme of education that is not allied with religion, and they shall attest at the same time the misappropriation of immense sums of public money by the State to purposes of proselytism, and to attain ends hostile to the best interests of our people.

But we are gravely told that Catholics are indifferent to the pursuits of science, and hence that they stand not in need of the higher schools of education. Catholics indifferent to the pursuits of science! And how is it that, despite the disadvantages under which they labour, nevertheless, in every branch of science, in every department of social culture, at home and abroad, in Church and State, in the academy or at the bar, they attain the posts of highest eminence? And throughout the long, dismal period of persecution, how is it that they risked every peril to secure for themselves abroad that education which was denied to them at home? How is it that whilst every avenue was closed to Irishmen in their own country, nevertheless, in the armies of France, and Austria, and Spain, and in every court and university of Europe, the highest honours were awarded to the Catholic genius of our island? In Ireland it was penal for Catholics to teach or to be taught. Still the spark of science was preserved unextinguished, and the treasures of classic lore were more eagerly sought for in the silent and secret retreats of our cities, and forests, and mountains, than in the more favoured halls of Trinity University. An Archbishop of Tuam stealthily kept a classical school, himself its teacher, in Galway, in 1582. Bishop Leverous, whose name shall ever be held in veneration, when driven from his see by the storm of persecution, taught another school in Limerick. Archbishop Creagh was appointed to the Primatial See from being tutor in that same school: and what shall I say of the schools of Waterford and Kilkenny, where Peter White, Dean of Waterford, won for himself the title of "the Happy Schoolmaster of Munster"? Why, I hesitate not to assert that the proscribed schools of Ireland, in the 17th century alone, gave to the pursuits of literature more distinguished men in every branch of science, than all the endowed schools of Protestantism in this island from the dawn of the Reformation to the present day.

Yes, the Catholics were ever anxious to pursue the higher paths of science. As early as 1565 they received permission

from Rome to erect a Catholic University in this country, the Papal Brief being addressed to Richard Creagh, Archbishop of Armagh, and to David Wolf, the Papal Commissary. At the momentary dawn of toleration in 1629, another such institution was called into existence; and so was it from time to time, till at the present day we have seen a Catholic University solemnly inaugurated in this city, and the people of Ireland, with the blessing of St. Peter's successor, have shown their resolve to maintain it despite every opposition, whencesoever it may come, by contributing to it from their scanty resources more than £130,000.

But instead of dwelling on these efforts to preserve the sources of science to our Catholic people, I would wish to point to the ages of faith, and I would say to those who, having laboured so long to seal against us every fountain of knowledge, would now seek to upbraid us with indifference to its pursuit—look to the early ages of Irish faith—contrast the past three centuries of Reformation barbarism with the three bright centuries when piety and science walked hand in hand, and diffused the blessings of peace and religion throughout the length and breadth of this island. Were our Catholic fathers then indifferent to the pursuit of science? Oh, ask Bangor, with its three thousand religious devoted to study and prayer; ask the ivy cave of Clonenagh, where a city of scholars sprung up around the cell of St. Fintan; ask Glendalough, Clonmacnoise, Clonfert, Glasnevin, Clonard, and Lismore; ask the islands of our lakes, studded with sanctuaries and schools; ask Lindisfarne or Iona, that isle of Columba's cell, where science and

> "Christian piety's soul-cheering spark,
> Kindled from Heaven between the light and dark
> Of time, shone like the morning star."

Or ask the regenerated nations of Europe who was it that trimmed for them the lamp of science, and saved them from barbarism. They will answer with one accord—from Brabant to Taranto, from the banks of the Danube to the shores of the Atlantic—that they owe their science and their civilization to missionaries from Ireland. They will tell you, with St. Bernard, that swarms of learned men went forth from Ireland, as bees from their parent hive, to enrich all Europe with honied stores of science and religion. They will answer you, with Eric of Auxerre, that all Ireland seemed to emigrate, not as at the present day, in search of a miserable subsistence and of a home, but in order to share with other nations the abundance of their knowledge. They will point to the great monasteries of St. Gall, Luxeuil, and Bobbio, for centuries the centres of Euro-

pean science ; they will tell you of universities founded, of the study of music revived, of the classic treasures preserved, of the art of illuminating cherished, of science in all its branches cultivated and taught by the Celtic and Catholic sons of St. Patrick. Yes, Ireland was then the home of science as it was of faith, the land of saints and of learned men.

> "It was the fairest and the sweetest scene,
> The freshest, sunniest, smiling land that e'er
> Held o'er the waves its arms of sheltering green,
> Unto the sea and storm-vexed mariner."

It is to secure once more for our own island these blessings of peace, and civilization, and religion, that we to-day insist upon our rights to a free and untrammelled Catholic education ; and never shall we relax our efforts till we see those happy ages of piety and science restored amongst us.

But we are also told that the era of persecution has long since passed, and that the educational institutions named in this resolution, and other similar establishments, now offer to Catholics the very highest fruits of science free from every religious restriction. I reply, that even so, such institutions are no boon to us, and that every true Catholic repudiates them. It is not necessary for me, however, to enter into this matter, as it forms the theme of another resolution. I shall only say that a Catholic parent who feels it to be his duty to prepare his children, not only for this world, but still more for their heavenly destiny, must instinctively shrink from intrusting their instruction to such institutions. If he wishes his children to be one day useful members of society, an honour to religion, a support to his declining years, he will sow betimes the seeds of virtue in their tender minds ; he will lead them to institutions where secular science is united with its heavenly aroma, and where the pursuit of human knowledge is linked with the tenets of faith ; and he will be careful to remove them from the influence of those whose teaching dries up the sources of every generous affection, and whose principles blight the very germs of honour, and virtue, and truth.

But, in addition to all this, there never was a time when a true Catholic spirit was more needed to animate and control education than at the present moment. Connected as Ireland now is with England, we have to guard our youth against the tide of impiety, immorality, infidelity, and, I might add, absolute paganism, with which the sister island has long since been inundated. We have to guard them against secret societies, to which the folly of our rulers, the wickedness of the Protestant press, the unwise teaching of the

Government, the perverse example of many in high station, urge on our people, and which, nevertheless, are the scourge of nations, and, like an ingenious network, overspreading all Europe, distil everywhere the poison of pernicious principles. It is only a true religious education that can save our youth from these perils; and therefore, in the interest of parents and children, in the name of society as of religion, we protest against all such schemes of education as are not quickened by religion. We protest against them, because they never yet have been the source of any blessing to Ireland. We protest against them, because they are not the institutions, to secure which our fathers suffered persecution, and exile, and death, for three hundred years. We protest against them, because they were not such schools that marked the golden era of our history, and won for our island a glorious name among civilized nations. We protest against them, in fine, because their history, their name, their traditions, are linked with Protestant ascendency; and we are resolved never to rest satisfied whilst a single trace of that ascendency remains in our island.

The Rev. T. Burke, O.P., proposed the following resolution:—

"That the mixed system of education on which the Queen's Colleges and existing model and training schools are founded, excluding, as it does, Catholic practices and the full teaching of Catholic truth, and repeatedly condemned by the Holy See and by our bishops, is a prolific source of religious indifferentism and practical infidelity."

When the Government of this country first thought of the education of the people, it made three great mistakes. Firstly, it began the work without understanding thoroughly what education is; secondly, it forgot that Ireland was a Catholic country; and thirdly, it resolved to make education a means whereby to deprive the people of their faith. Out of these three causes comes the grave fact asserted in the resolution which I have the honour to propose to you, namely, that the system of education on which the Queen's Colleges and existing model and training schools are founded, is a prolific source of religious indifferentism and practical infidelity. The resolution affirms that these terrible evils flow from the mixed system of education; and, as I have said, the Government of this Catholic country, in enforcing such a system, shows, firstly, that it does not understand what education is; secondly, that it ignores the great fact, that in attempting to educate Irish children, it tries to educate Catholics; and, thirdly, that it is

hostile to the faith of our people, and, consequently, to be opposed by us on the question of education by every means in our power, and at the peril of our eternal salvation.

It is well that men should understand this. It is in no spirit of bigotry nor factious opposition that we assemble and speak on such occasions as the present. We are obliged by conscience, by our sacred position, by our relations to our people and to the Church, by the awful responsibility which our priesthood imposes on us, to speak and act strongly and energetically for the integrity, purity, and Catholicity of education in this land. Other men may be silent, but we cannot, without destruction to ourselves and our people—others may be willing to compromise, but we may not, for compromise means spiritual ruin —others may be indifferent to this great question, but we must stand or fall by the people, for whom we must render an account to God; and indifference in a priest means treason to God, to the Church, to souls. We can afford to be patient when accused of exclusiveness and bigotry, for we look not to this world but to eternity; and when men reproach us for our importunity and bid us be silent, it is either because they do not understand us at all, or they would have us silent, just as the thief would fain silence the watch-dog, and so plunder the house in safety. Now, what is mixed education? It is a bringing together children of all religions or of no religion at all, instructing them in common on all secular topics, to the utter exclusion of religion, which is left to the parents and respective pastors of the children. In the school, as a school, there must be no religious teaching, of any definite kind, at all. If at any time religious instruction is to be given, the school ceases to be a school for the time, the children (if they be of different denominations) are separated from one another; in fact, the school is broken up for the moment for purposes of religious instruction; but as long as the children are together, the name of religion is supposed never to be mentioned, no religious symbol must ever meet the eye, no passing allusion must ever be made to angel or saint, nor may a word of doctrine ever be uttered. It is a system that turns God out of the school, and refuses to recognize him or acknowledge him, save, perhaps, with a kind of formal toleration, for about half an hour in the day. It is a system in which religion has only a very secondary place, if it have any place at all. Such is mixed education.

Now, I ask, Could the men who inaugurated such a system have understood what education means? I venture to doubt whether they ever seriously asked themselves what is its very definition. To educate means to bring out every power of the

soul, to give to each its own form and definite perfection; in a word, to make of the unformed, unreasoning child, a man—a man only for this world, says the statesman—a man for this world and for heaven besides, says the Church; but whether for this world or for heaven, or for both, still a man. Now, the soul which is thus to be formed by education, has two great powers which are its very self—the intellect and the will. The intellect is the seat of knowledge—the will the source of action. Education must reach both, if it be worthy the name of education; it must master both one and the other. Even if it be a question of merely forming a man for this world, yet must he be made pure, moral, honest, truth-telling—yet must he be able to restrain his passions and to govern himself. The weakness of the intellect is ignorance—the weakness of the will that selfishness which is natural to all, and which, uncorrected, would break down every barrier to self-indulgence, and trample upon every law. The office of education is to remedy both these evils. The remedy for the first, namely, ignorance, is easy enough—instruct the child, pour into the mind the light of knowledge—give to the intellect its proper food, which is the idea, and you have so far accomplished your work. But how are we to reach the second great power of the soul—the will? How are we to touch and influence that great faculty on which the man's future life and action on society entirely depend? Will knowledge alone be sufficient to form that will? No. Philosophy says no, because knowledge has for its object intellectual excellence alone, and not virtue. Faith says no, for without divine grace, which is quite distinct from knowledge, it is impossible for man to govern his passions. History says no, and points out to us the most refined and highly educated people of antiquity, at the same time most corrupted in morals, and lost to every sense of public and private virtue. Experience says no, for we see that the men of our own day, who are the greatest enemies and disturbers of society, are by no means deficient in knowledge, but in the powers of self-restraint and obedience. "Knowledge," says Newman, "is one thing, virtue is another; good sense is not conscience, refinement is not humility, nor is largeness and justness of view, faith. Knowledge, however enlightened, however profound, gives no command over the passions, no influential motives, no vivifying principles . . . Quarry the granite rock with razors, or moor the vessel with a thread of silk, then may you hope, with such keen and delicate instruments as human knowledge and human reason, to contend with those giants—the passion and the pride of man."

The formation of the will through the heart and the affec-

tions is the work, not of man, but of God. You expect too much of the teacher when you ask him to educate a child thoroughly, unless you put into his hands not alone the means of imparting knowledge, but also the means of infusing into the youthful will the powerful agency of divine grace. Religion, and religion alone, can do this. Religion, in the fulness of its teaching, informing the intellect with the highest form of knowledge—namely, faith—the highest both in the order of certainty, which transcends that of the first principles of science, and in the object of its knowledge, which is God. Religion in its full, free, and unrestrained exercise and action on the young heart and affections, making its salutary impressions in time, illustrating its holy teaching by the earliest associations of childhood, familiarizing the opening mind, through eye and ear, with the things of God, and, above all, sanctifying and preserving the soul of the child by sacramental grace. It is thus that education, even for this world, is made complete. The child thus trained becomes a truthful man, for there is in his mind a first principle of truth which nothing in this world can shake, as it came to him from God—that is, faith. He becomes a lover of law and obedient to it, for he has been educated in principles of obedience to God, to his Church, and to those who govern the commonwealth, and this not merely from sentiment but for conscience.

Now, the mixed education, against which we protest, deprives the children of our people of all that specific religious teaching, and of all those practices of religion which we justly look upon as by far the most important feature of education, inasmuch as they determine the future morality of the man, and his action in the world either for good or for evil.

But there is still a more serious charge made against this system of mixed education, viz., that not only is it imperfect, as we have seen in its inability to form the will, to touch the heart, to purify the affections, but that even in its purely intellectual aspect it leads to religious indifferentism and practical infidelity. Religious indifferentism in a Catholic means a neglect of all the duties and practices of his holy religion. Now, what is more likely to produce this indifference than a system of education which carefully excludes religious symbolism, which divests the teacher of all sacredness in the eyes of the child, which makes no decided religious impression on the child at all? Let us suppose even that religious instruction be given for half an hour every day. It is still imparted simply as knowledge; never throughout the day reduced to practice by a single religious act, never brought back to the pupil's mind by the slightest religious illustration or insinuation of any kind—

never enforced in its precepts—never deepened in its impressions—never watched over, nor fortified by sacramental grace. In a word, the most that can be said of it is, that it is religion in theory without practice. Worse than indifference, such a system leads to practical infidelity, which means a giving up of all religion, both in theory and in practice. The first step towards making an infidel is to give the child a low mean estimate of religion. Let secular education be all in all; let religion be put aside, no matter from what cause; let there be no specific teaching or practice of any form of religion, and you infallibly make the child a latitudinarian, which is another name for an infidel. Mixed education is founded on this principle. Bring children of all denominations together, for one religion is as good as another; exclude all specific religious teaching, for we profess no religion whatsoever, and in this fatal compromise the Catholic loses everything, the Protestant loses nothing.

Education, based on what is called "our common Christianity," means, as far as the Catholic child is concerned, education without sacraments, without the practice of prayer, without restraint over our thoughts, without self-examination, without any fixed ideas as to the nature of sin, without angels or saints, without a thought for the faithful departed, without the obligation of confession, without the Holy Communion—in fact, before the Catholic can meet his Protestant brother on the ground of "our common Christianity," he must make himself an infidel.

But let us suppose all this not to be the case. Yet, as Catholics, we cannot accept a system of education which has been condemned by the Holy See and by our bishops. Our legislators must know that we are bound by the very principles of our religion to accept the decisions of the head of the Church, not only on matters of faith, but also on all questions of morality, and which touch our spiritual interests. I ask them simply, Do they acknowledge us as Catholics, and legislate for us as such? or do they still wish to ignore our religion, force our consciences, persecute our faith, and coerce us to accept for our children a system of education which we know, and believe, and declare to be unsound in principle, and fatal to us in practice? Surely if the wrongs of Ireland are ever to be redressed, it is high time to begin that salutary and necessary work; and amongst these wrongs must be numbered a system of education forced upon us, which is deficient in itself, which instructs us as if we were Pagans and not Catholics, and which has been emphatically condemned by what we hold to be a divine authority. When we seek for a remedy for this great evil, we seek only to redress one of the long list

of grievances which press upon Ireland. We seek only one act of justice of the many denied to us, until our people have been goaded and worried into every kind of excess and rebellion. We seek only for one act of justice of the many due to us, and which, until it is granted, will be a standing cause of disaffection in our land, and a discredit of the Government.

The Rev. Canon ROCHE, P.P., seconded the resolution, which was adopted.

The Very Rev. Monsignor M'CABE proposed the next resolution :—

"That the present educational disadvantages of Catholics are the result of a period of confiscations and penal legislation, endured for conscience sake; and as it is unreasonable to expect that, thus despoiled in past times of their property, both public and personal, they can meet all necessary educational demands, we call on the Government to aid our educational institutions from the public exchequer, so long as hostile educational and religious institutions are maintained in the possession of endowments conferred upon them by the State, and derived for the most part from Catholic property."

My Lord Cardinal, an English peer, who, from his experience as a late Chief Governor of Ireland, seemed to speak with authority, declared in his place in Parliament that disaffection reigned through this land ; and an influential English journal, re-echoing the same sentiments, admitted, a few days ago, that "probably there never was, at any period of our connexion with Ireland, a time when the country was more widely and deeply disaffected than it is at present. Ireland," continues this writer, "is fast drifting into hopeless disaffection." If this be the fact, what is the explanation? Disloyalty is not the crime of our race. Before the stranger came amongst us, the country was, no doubt, weakened by the conflicts of rival kings and chieftains ; but, as a rule, the septs were loyal to their chiefs as the sons of Ireland are loyal to their parents. Feuds and jealousies might array the individual against his neighbour, and sept against sept ; but the people were prepared, at a moment's notice, to make with their dead bodies a rampart around their trusted chieftains. Is not the history of the Cromwellian settlement a history of Irish loyalty, even to a strange dynasty? On the authority of Strafford, certainly no friend to Irish Catholics, Plowden tells us that "the Puritans dreaded the loyalty more than the religion of the Catholics ;" and that "the Irish were the first and last in arms for King Charles, notwithstanding the duplicity and severity they experienced from the Crown." The crimsoned waters of the Boyne, commingled with the ocean, told to every shore of Europe that Irishmen were heroically—might I say foolishly?—

loyal to a very worthless race. Irishmen have proved their loyalty to their adopted country across the Atlantic, by floating the banner of America on a sea of their own blood. They are loyal in Australia, they are loyal in Canada; yet Ireland, as we are informed, "is fast drifting into hopeless disaffection." If this be a true statement—and those who made it certainly believe it—do the statesmen of England ever take the trouble of ascertaining the cause of this phenomenon in Irish history? This cause cannot be traced to a fault of our race. Does it lie hidden in the bosoms of our rulers? A great English statesman had the courage to declare, some time ago, that as the government of England was carried out in accordance with the principles and habits of English life, and the government of Scotland was moulded on the pattern of Scotland's character—so, he continues, if we are to have peace and prosperity in Ireland, she must be governed in accordance with her cherished convictions. He was laughed at for his discovery, and his great constitutional doctrine was put down to his credit as another of his crotchets. No, English statesmen will not take the trouble of studying the character of our people. They never enter into sympathy with our Celtic feelings—or, if you like to call it so, our Irish prejudices. Ireland must be ruled as though we had lost all our traditions as Irishmen and Catholics —and, as a consequence, our unhappy country has been for centuries coerced, but not governed.

Will any man, therefore, be at a loss for an explanation of the phenomenon? Ireland, always loyal, sometimes foolishly loyal, "is fast drifting into hopeless disaffection." On no single point have our rulers more persistently violated this true principle of government, enunciated by Mr. Gladstone, than on the question which brings us here to-day. Systems of education, utterly repugnant to the tastes and principles of our Catholic and Celtic race, have been the only systems which have ever found favour with English statesmen. The Diocesan Schools of Elizabeth, the Royal Schools of King James, the schools of Erasmus Smith, founded from estates obtained under Cromwell's settlement, the Charter Schools of George II., the Kildare-street Schools, the Queen's Colleges, and the so-called System of National Education, were all either deadly assaults on the faith of Ireland, or at least contemptuous disregard of the holiest feelings of our Catholic nation. If England and Scotland were so treated for three hundred years, would any thinking man be astonished at seeing them drifting "into hopeless disaffection"? But we are continually told that it is impolitic and unfair to rake up the ashes of past ages in search of weapons to wound a generation who are in no way responsible for the acts of other men and other times. We

are told that Christian charity ought to be allowed to cover, with her ample mantle, the injustice of bygone days. We are continually reminded of the duty of oblivion and forgiveness. Our answer is very simple. First, if England will insist on sounding her glory in the genius of her orators and statesmen of other days, and in the triumphs of her great warriors, she must be content to incur the odium of her deeds of cruelty in days gone by, until those deeds are formally disowned. Secondly, we are prepared to forgive and forget, whenever we see tokens of true repentance on the part of those from whom such wrongs proceeded. But our theology tells us that an ingredient of sorrow for injustice is a firm purpose of restitution, and that the man who makes not reparation for the injury inflicted on his neighbour, again and again perpetrates his original crimes. If our rulers, then, are prepared to repair the past, we are prepared to forgive for the future; but that we may not forgive too softly, let us see on what principles our claims to reparation are based. Let us see the amount of injury of which we have been victims.

We maintain, then, that our demands on the British Government rest upon two principles of right—"commutative and distributive justice." We were stripped of our own in past ages; we are denied to-day our legitimate demands on a treasury which we all contribute to sustain—hence our claim. The ample provisions which our forefathers made for the education of our people, have been ruthlessly torn from us. For years the sword dealt impartial destruction to the schoolmaster and the priest; and when the sword ceased to do its work, legislation took care that Catholic charity should not find its way to the foundation of schools for the education of the country. We were first robbed directly, by being plundered of what we actually held; we were secondly plundered indirectly, by being rendered incompetent to receive and to hold: and on the principles of common justice we now claim reparation for this twofold wrong. Everybody who knows anything of the monastic system as it flourished in Ireland, must also know that no matter what other duties engaged the attention of the holy recluses, education entered as an essential duty into the every-day lives and habits of the devoted Cenobites. When the enlightenment of ages was extinguished by the rude tramp of the barbarous invader, the sanctified inhabitants of the cloisters menaced again and again the work of civilization and religion. The rude hand of the destroyer might create a chaos around him; but from these sacred asylums of religion and science God spoke, "Fiat lux," and at his command light sprung from darkness—order from desolation. When,

by permission of God's inscrutable providence, the arch-enemy of our religion launched his deadly hatred against everything that bore the name of Rome and of Ireland, he acted most wisely in proclaiming a deadly hostility to that system which hitherto kept alive in our unhappy country the sacred fire of secular and sacred science. A glance at the pages where the deeds of the enemy of religion and Ireland are recorded, will attest the fact that, as far as unbridled tyranny could carry into execution the suggestion of greed and impiety, the work of ruin flourished in all its hideous perfection. Loftus, quoted by Dr. Moran, admits that in his very first swoop on the monasteries and other religious foundations of Ireland, real property to the amount of thirty-two thousand pounds a-year fell into the hands of the spoiler; and that in this very first campaign against civilization, Henry VIII. possessed himself of one hundred thousand pounds in moveable property.

If any one wishes to form even an approximate idea of the deeds of rapine which marked the course of Henry and his successors in their war of extermination against those old seats of sanctity and learning, he need but read some such book as "The Monasticon Hibernicum," by Archdall. Let us, merely for illustration, take up one single county—that of Dublin—and let us see the sad havoc which the ruthless enemies of God and man created in our down-trodden land. St. Mary's Abbey drew on its devoted head the attention of the Vandals of Henry's court. All its vast possessions were seized on in 1540, and in 1543 the abbey itself was granted, *in capite*, to the Earl of Kildare, for the keeping of his horses, whenever he was obliged to attend parliament; and in the twenty-fourth year of her reign, Elizabeth gave it for ever to Thomas, Earl of Ormond. The Abbey of St. Thomas, Thomas-street, was possessed of large estates in the county Wicklow and other places. This celebrated abbey was doomed, and its property was divided amongst the friends of the new order; and, amongst others, William Brabazon, an ancestor of the Earl of Meath, became enriched by its plunder to a very large amount. The Priory of St. John the Baptist, on whose site, in after times, stood the old Catholic Church of St. James, at the west end of Thomas-street, was torn from the hands of its righteous owners, and became the property of Maurice, Earl of Thomond. The Friary of St. Saviour, which stood upon the site of the present Four Courts, was surrendered by Patrick Hay, its last prior. This foundation, along with the Dominican Abbey of Trim, was conferred by Henry on Thomas Cusack. The Abbey of Finglas, probably, as Archdall admits, founded by St. Patrick, was dispossessed of its rights, to enrich the chancellorship of St.

Patrick's Cathedral. Grace Dieu, in the barony of Balruddery, was handed over to Patrick Barnwell. The priory of "Holm Patrick," originally founded "in Inis Patrick," where St. Malachy held a synod of fifteen bishops and two hundred priests, was, with its immense territorial possessions, given by Queen Elizabeth to Thomas Fitzwilliam. The celebrated Priory of St. John, Kilmainham, plundered under King Henry, and restored again under Mary, was finally stripped of all its property under Elizabeth and James. Christ Church, founded and endowed by Sitric, where subsequently St. Laurence O'Toole established the Canons of Augustine, was converted by Henry into a dean and chapter; and to conclude this list of sacrilegious plunder, All Hallows, in Hoggin-green, was stripped of its possessions in favour of the city of Dublin; and in 1590, at the instigation of Loftus, its walls were pulled down to contribute to the erection of a Protestant University. The work of ruin and plunder carried out in Dublin and its vicinity, was everywhere attempted as far as the power of the royal enemies of religion and civilization could extend. And the mouldering walls of Mellifont, Jerpoint, Graighnamannagh, Baltinglass, Dunbrody, Tintern, Trim, Duleek, and Bective, proclaimed to many generations the fearful wrongs of our unhappy country; and even to-day their mournful ruins call for restitution from the hands of the nation by whose power this dread misery was caused. No appeal from justice, mercy, or even policy, could stay the hand of sacrilege. In 1539, states the "Endowed Schools' Commission," the report of a commission for the suppression of abbeys called forth a recommendation for the preservation of some six of the religious houses, for the reason that "in them young men and children, both gentlemen's children and other, both of mankind and womankind, be brought up in virtue, learning, and the English tongue and behaviour, to the great charge of the said houses, that is to say, the womankind of the whole Englishry of this land, for the one part, in the said nunnery, and the mankind in the other said houses." The demand was refused, and all perished in the common ruin.

We can scarcely form an estimate of the amount of plunder which fell into the spoiler's hands by the suppression of these houses of piety and learning. We can scarcely picture the fearful injury inflicted on our country by the destruction of those schools of science. But that we may be in a position to form a rough estimate of the wrongs inflicted on the nation at large, we may take up an instance, namely, the Abbey of St. Mary. We read that this celebrated abbey was possessed of more than two thousand acres of land, scattered through

the counties of Dublin, Meath, and Louth. In addition to this vast territorial estate, it possessed thirty-four messuages, various castles and mills, and sixteen rectories through the country. To these immense treasures, torn directly from the Church, and applicable to a large extent to the education of the country, we may fairly set down, as against the English Government, the plunder of the loyal Catholics who fought and suffered for an ungrateful dynasty. Dr. Reid, as quoted by the "Endowed Schools' Commission," states that in the counties of Derry, Donegal, Tyrone, Armagh, Fermanagh and Cavan, four hundred thousand acres of land were forfeited, and that of these four hundred thousand acres, one hundred thousand were appropriated to church, school, and corporation purposes, all equally hostile to this Catholic land.

But the wrongs for which we claim restitution, are not all summed up yet. We were not only plundered of the endowments which the piety of ages consecrated to the cause of religion and civilization, but in addition systems expressly devised to destroy all the instincts of national life, and all the principles of religion, were attempted to be forced on us by the most heartless cruelty. Scully, in his Penal Laws, gives the exordium of a petition to King George the Second, presented in 1732 by the Primate, Chancellor, Archbishops and Bishops of that day. In this petition his Majesty was told that great tracts of mountain and coarse land in Ireland are almost universally inhabited by Papists—that these Papists far exceeded the Protestants of all sects in numbers—that they are kept in gross ignorance and great disaffection to his Majesty—and that, unless they be instructed in religion and loyalty, idolatry, superstition, and disaffection to the royal family must go on increasing from generation to generation. The King listened to this atrocious libel, and the Charter Schools were the offspring of his wicked credulity. When Scully wrote, in 1812, there were forty of these strongholds of proselytism scattered through the country, and they counted about 2,350 inmates, the kidnapped children of unhappy Catholic parents. To people these dens of abomination, children were forced from their parents, compelled to shun their kindred, and to renounce the first duties of nature.

And in the report of the Commissioners of Endowed Schools, we are told that a charter was granted by George the Third, in 1769, for the foundation of the Hibernian School, on a petition from some of the principal nobility and gentry of the country. These philanthropic men stated that they were moved to look for this charter by a desire of saving the children of deceased or absent soldiers from "Popery, beggary, and idleness."

But the evils to which unhappy Ireland was subjected on this most important question of education did not rest here. We were not only driven from the fountains of knowledge which the piety of our forefathers had provides for us. We were not only tempted, nay dragged by force, to the muddy pools, charged with the deadliest poison. Cruelty and injustice went yet further; we were forbidden, under penalty of death, to attempt to save our race from ignorance and apostasy. The schoolmaster who taught even a Catholic child the rudiments of knowledge, incurred the risk of perpetual banishment, and if he dared ever again to enter his country, the death of a felon was to be his reward. These cruel laws were mitigated in 1781, by an Act "to allow persons professing the Popish religion to teach schools in this kingdom;" but even in that piece of merciful legislation, it was enacted that, before a Roman Catholic could open a school for Catholic children, he must first obtain a licence from the Protestant bishop of the diocese, and this licence might be revoked at any moment at the mere whim of this hostile official. This uncompromising hostility to the education of Catholics by Catholics, flourished even in this very age, for within the present century, Catholics could make no provision for the education of their Catholic countrymen by will, as every bequest for such a purpose was treated as one for superstitious uses, and was consequently null and void by law.

But we may be told that the past has been gloriously atoned for by the munificence of modern Governments in favour of education in Ireland, and that Catholics have received more than their fair proportion of public educational grants. Whether this assertion be made in favour of Government plans for university, primary, or intermediate education, we can meet the statement with an emphatic contradiction, We are told we have the Queen's Colleges, and I answer the Queen's Colleges are a standing insult to the Catholic spirit of Ireland. They are simply proselytizing institutions under a more attractive title. They are an open defiance of the authority of the head of the Christian world. Their mission is to make men bad Catholics, by first making them disobedient children of the Common Father. We cannot, therefore, accept them as an atonement for past wrongs; we merely regard them as a perpetuation of former insults. But Trinity College is open to Catholics; the spider's parlour is open to the fly; but if the little insects see the dry skeleton of their former companion gracing the web, surely they may plead not guilty to the charge of ingratitude if they refuse to trust their wings to the tempting transparency. And, alas! how many withered

skeletons of men, once full of Catholic life, are to be found in the web which Trinity College has cast around its victims ; and yet we are to accept the opening of its doors to Catholics as a boon to our faithful people ! No doubt much good has accrued to the country from the primary schools sustained or aided by the Board of National Education. But a few facts in connexion with the National System cannot be forgotten. First, was it not the untiring watchfulness of the Irish prelates which baffled its chiefest patrons in their attempt to convert it into a system of proselytism? Answer Dr. Whately's Confession, recorded by his daughter. Secondly, were not its books cunningly compiled for the purpose of denationalizing and decatholicizing—perhaps I might add dechristianizing—the children of the poor ? And, thirdly, is it not a fact that even yet, after all our efforts, it maintains in offensive splendour training schools and model schools, which are as repugnant to Catholic principles and as hostile to Catholic interest as the godless colleges themselves ? For this boon, then, we cannot be reasonably called on to forget and pardon all past wrongs and insults.

What do we ask, therefore ? Do we seek retaliation for by-gone indignities ? God forbid. If Catholics were to be invested to-morrow with political omnipotence, he amongst us who would dare to propose the infliction of wrong on others in revenge for wrongs sustained by ourselves, would be driven with scorn from our midst. In reparation for all our educational injuries, we simply ask for educational equality. The Anglican parent has an university whither he can send his son without wounding his conscience or lowering his sense of honour. The Presbyterian youth can obtain university degrees without a compromise of his principles or a surrender of his independence. The Catholic who enters either of our two universities, does so by violating the dictates of conscience, which tells him that the man who loves danger will perish in it—that we cannot touch pitch and remain undefiled. Is it just, is it wise, is it politic, to force our people either to abjure the authority of conscience and religion, or forego academic distinctions ?

As I commenced let me finish. We are told that deep-rooted discontent pervades our country. The Fenian organization proclaims that discontent in the voice of passion. The remonstrance against religious inequality, which already has received the signatures of two hundred of our most thoughtful men, proclaims that discontent in the calm words of reason. Ireland is not governed in accordance with Irish sentiments and Irish principle, and hence she is "drifting into hopeless disaffection," according to English journalists. Will our states-

men permit this evil to go on increasing from generation to generation? Let them only give us justice and equality with our fellow-countrymen, and the loyalty for which our country was celebrated in days gone by will burst forth again. And if the time should ever come when the legitimate monarchs of these kingdoms should require generous hearts and brave swords for their defence, they will find the Irish Catholics what the unworthy Stuart before found them, "the first and the last in arms in defence of their imperilled authority."

The Very Rev. Canon FARRELL, P.P., said—I have the honour to second the resolution which has been proposed and so ably spoken to by Dr. M'Cabe. This resolution affirms an indisputable and self-evident proposition, that we have an inalienable right to aid from the public exchequer for our educational institutions, so long as our Protestant and Dissenting fellow-subjects are in the possession and enjoyment of similar advantages; and this right becomes all the more necessary to be vindicated, inasmuch as the property left for educational purposes by the piety of our ancestors in bygone times, has been confiscated and diverted to the usages of a hostile religion. We proclaim it as a scandalous injustice—the fruitful source of discontent in this country, and inconsistent with the boasted freedom and impartiality of the British constitution that whilst our Protestant and Dissenting fellow-subjects possess large endowments for the higher branches of education, either given directly by the State treasury, or derived from the confiscation of Catholic property, we, the Catholic millions, are denied these important privileges, and are thus placed at a great social disadvantage. For high-class education, 678,000 Protestants of the Anglican denomination in Ireland have the magnificently endowed institution of Trinity College, which has lately been so aptly and truly designated by the Protestant Bishop of Cork as the mother of Irish Protestantism, into which no Catholic can enter without peril to his faith, its religious teaching being un-Catholic, and nearly all its professional staff Anglican clergymen. Again, for high-class education, 586,000 Dissenters have the Belfast College richly endowed by the State, which the Presbyterians have made their own, finding it congenial to their religious views, but where, by reason of its un-Catholic influence and teaching, there is to be found at the present moment scarcely a single one of the million Catholics of the north of Ireland, whilst the Queen's Colleges of Cork and Galway are condemned by the Holy See, by the Irish bishops, and by all who are worthy of

the name of Catholic, as godless and dangerous to faith and morals.

Under these untoward circumstances, the Catholic majority in this country, finding themselves debarred from the advantages of university education, and placed in a position socially and intellectually inferior to their Protestant fellow-countrymen, with that noble ardour for intellectual advancement which always distinguished them, resolved, at a vast pecuniary sacrifice, to establish a university where high-class education might be permeated by the benign and ameliorating influence of the Catholic faith. To the shame of the English Government be it said, that up to this hour we have been unable to obtain from them the costless, but to us vitally important, favour of a Charter or State recognition. They admit the broad Christian principle that the education of a people should be influenced by and in accordance with its religious formularies. They ungrudgingly carry out this principle to its fullest extent in favour of some three million Presbyterians in Scotland, affording them not alone chartered universities, but liberally supporting them from the State treasury. They extend the same favour to English Dissenters, for whose advantage the London University is chartered and largely endowed by the imperial exchequer. These two numerous sects of religionists in England and Scotland, refuse to avail themselves of the advantages of the Universities of Oxford and Cambridge, because the religious teachings of these great institutions is not in accordance with their religious views. The Government recognizes their right to separate education, and allocates to them large endowments from the State treasury; but when four and a-half millions of Irish Catholics ask for equal justice and an extension of the same principles, they make a scandalous exception. They say to us—"'Tis true that we have established and that we continue to support, for Presbyterians in Scotland, for Dissenters in England, and even for Mahomedans and Hindoos in British India, universities in accordance with their religious views, and free from all Anglican influence, teaching, or control; but you, the Catholics of Ireland, though you contribute to the imperial exchequer equally with them, must either send your youth to be educated by the Anglican divines in Trinity College, the mother of Irish Protestantism, according to Dr. Gregg, or to the Queen's Colleges, which altogether ignore religion, and which you repudiate as a gigantic scheme of godless education, dangerous to faith and morals. Otherwise you may remain in ignorance, and be content to be hewers of wood and drawers of water in your own land." My Lord Cardinal, can anything be more unjust, or better calculated to barbarize and degrade a nation, and to create discontent in this country?

But this injustice is so palpable and so flagrant, that our rulers are at length ashamed of it. A Charter for our University will doubtless be granted during the coming session of Parliament. This resolution affirms that we shall not be content with this miserable instalment of justice. It vindicates our right to a State endowment for a University established by our own money, by our own energy, and by our zeal for learning; it declares that with less than this we can never rest satisfied so long as our Anglican or dissenting fellow-subjects enjoy the advantages of universities endowed by the imperial exchequer, to which we contribute equally with them relative to our numbers. It further demands separate training schools for Catholic pupil teachers in Ireland, such as the State provides and supports for the Dissenters and the Catholics in England—such as I have had the satisfaction of seeing at Hammersmith, near London, where those who were to instruct the Catholic youth of England were themselves trained for the future discharge of those important duties, and properly instructed in the principles of the Catholic faith under a religious order. This, with similar institutions in England, is amply supported by a grant from the State, which never interferes with its religious teaching, but is content with seeing that the secular education is good of its kind, and that the funds given by the State are properly administered.

It may be asked how it happens that the Catholics of England, in other respects so unfairly treated, enjoy this great boon. We may be well assured that if left to themselves, it would never be granted them; but, fortunately for them, by the law of the land, they come within the great family of Dissenters, who peremptorily expressed their resolve not to suffer the teachers of their youth to be trained under Anglican influence. Their demand was recognized as just and expedient, and the Catholics could not be excluded. We, my Lord, after the example of the Dissenters in England, demand as a right, that those who are to be the instructors of our youth, shall themselves be trained under the influence of our own faith. This right cannot be denied us on any principle of justice or of expediency. We make this appeal to the justice of British statesmen, not merely on behalf of the four and a-half million Catholics in Ireland, but also on behalf of our Catholic fellow-countrymen scattered over the British Empire—in England, in Australia, in Canada, as well as those in North and South America. These Catholic millions look back with loving interest to the affairs of their native land—they participate in our sense of wrong, and they have given practical evidence of their zeal and anxiety for freedom of education in the land of their birth, by subscribing

largely to the foundation of our National University. In the name, then, of some ten million Catholics of Irish birth, we demand redress for the educational grievances and injustices under which we labour.

My Lord Cardinal, as I have said, the denial of our rights in this vitally important matter is a fruitful source of discontent, and one of the leading causes for disaffection in this unhappy and distracted country. It serves to feed the flame of Fenianism; and I do believe that the real head centres of that pestilent organization are to be found not here or in America, but amongst her Majesty's cabinet ministers, who continue to deny to us our just rights, and who permit session after session to pass by without a remedy for any of the admitted grievances under which we labour. I should, perhaps, except their "Oaths of Office Bill." For this we have reason to thank them, although the grievance was sentimental rather than practical. From this meeting, my Lord Cardinal, we call on them no longer to trifle with the wrongs of the Irish people. We ask them to remove from us the monstrous incubus of an alien Church Establishment—we ask them to legislate wisely and justly for the Irish tenant—we demand of them, in an especial manner, a charter and an endowment for our National University, similar to those with which our fellow-subjects of other denominations are favoured. We call upon Lord Stanley, the present Minister of Foreign Affairs, who gave freedom of education and State endowment to the Hindoos and Mahomedans in India, based, as he declared, on the principle of perfect religious neutrality, and on an absence of any interference with the religious habits and practices of the natives—we call upon him now to vindicate for the Irish Catholics the same rights and privileges. If, my Lord Cardinal, our rulers should happily at length resolve to legislate for this country in this wise, beneficent, and impartial spirit, there will shortly be no home or resting-place for Fenianism in the Irish heart, and we shall have a loyal, a prosperous, and a contented people.

The Rev. Father DIXON proposed the next resolution, which was as follows :—

"That as it is most important that children should be trained from their infancy in the knowledge and practice of their religion, and as this cannot be adequately done in schools conducted on the mixed principle, we call upon the Government to introduce the denominational system into all primary schools; and we make this demand the more readily as a vast number of such schools are virtually unmixed."

For you, Gentlemen, enlightened and convinced as you are on the subject now before us, I think this resolution requires

no argument to support it, nor admits of any discussion. We know that it is the right, and also the duty, of the Catholic Church, and of the bishops and pastors, in whom, and by whom, the Church acts and speaks, to watch over and to guard the education of Catholic children from the first dawn of reason. Nor can the Church or the pastors of the Church ever consent to renounce this right, or to neglect this duty. For what, let me ask, are the mutual relations that exist between the Catholic Church and the Catholic child? The Church protects that child before it is born, guarding by heaviest censure that no one shall injure or extinguish it in its mother's womb; but when that child is born and brought to the waters of baptism, the Church becomes its mother on higher and stronger titles than its earthly parents can lay claim to; and if this child, once baptized, can never forsake the Church on any account, how could the Church forsake the child, and most of all at that time of youth when all depends on the culture and training it receives, and when the impressions made of good or evil are the most fixed and lasting? No; for in conferring baptism on that child, the Church has placed in it the sacred deposit of faith, which she must guard; and with the moral virtues then infused, the Church has sown in it, as it were, the seed of religion, which she must water and nourish into growth and maturity. For any education, therefore, but still more for primary education, and most of all for infant education, the Church is not and cannot be satisfied with the mixed principle. Take an infant school conducted on the mixed principle reduced to practice, in which the teacher, the school-book, the patron, the manager, the lady visitors are un-Catholic or anti-Catholic. What, I ask, does a child in such a school see, or feel, or hear, to awaken its faith with its reason, or to dispose it to the love and practice of religion? And though the child should hear nothing in this school against the Catholic Church, yet, as it hears nothing there in favour and support of that Church, this silence alone is enough to chill its faith and to weaken it for life. Besides, a child at that tender age takes up its accent from those around it and over it; and so it takes in its impressions from their looks, their maxims, their manners, and the very features of their face.

The great evil, then, I say of the National System, is its mixed principle; and if this fundamental evil be not removed, the whole system must break up; or, if it should continue, it must continue only as one of the many prolific sources of conflict and division in this unhappy country. It reminds me of the ivy-tree that grew over Jonas whilst he sat under the rays of the sun to watch the destruction of Ninive. The ivy-tree

afforded Jonas shelter for a time; but the Scripture says that there was a worm in the tree that struck it with blight, and it withered. The gnawing worm of the National System is at its mixed principle. How was that system founded, and for what end devised? Why, the model school was to be the sun and centre of the system, its form and perfection, and mark the principle of the model school, and the practice too. Why, whilst for the other schools and classes the teacher may or may not be Protestant, for the infant model school the teacher must be Protestant. How was this arrangement brought about? With what aim, and for what object? Why might not a Catholic master or a Catholic mistress be placed over Catholic infants in the model schools? There was foresight in this—there was profound penetration in this—there was deep, dark calculation in it. The model school was to be spread and propagated in every town and village, a beautiful attractive building was to arise, favoured with many advantages for teachers and for children; and thus all the Catholic infants of the poor were to be got under Protestant moulding at that very tender age, when they take cast for life, and so they were to come out from this gentle, amiable process, if not full Protestant, at least half Catholic, disposed, as they would grow up, to blend in society, and to take liberal and enlightened views on questions of faith and practices of devotion. And so it was that Dr. Whately and others of his stamp, like Jonas under his ivy-tree, thought they might sit down calmly under the shade of this system, and look on at this Irish Babylon of Popery dissolving before their eyes, and disappearing out of sight.

Now, I say this very mixed principle on which statesmen relied so much, to carry out their designs, has proved the failure, and, I might add, the overthrow of the system; for when the bishops perceived the leaven of mixture spreading—when model schools began to be multiplied—then they took alarm, raised their voice, denounced such schools, resisted their spread, and frustrated their designs. And owing to this mixed, or, to speak more properly, this anti-Catholic principle of education, and the unceasing effort to extend it, what has the National System become—this supposed boon of conciliation to Catholics? Why it has become the battle-ground of bitter strife, as if there were not other elements enough of discord in Ireland. And what is that system to-day? I say it is a wreck. How is its Board composed at present? Why have the bishops and archbishops that took part at first in its deliberations fled from it with horror of that cancer, ever creeping and encroaching, of the mixed principle? Where are the Catholic young men and Catholic young women that crowded the halls of the

training schools? Frightened away by the commands of the bishops and censures of the Church; and now none but Protestants are being trained to impart knowledge to the Catholic children of the poor. What use is made of those costly buildings, the Model Schools, in the various towns of Ireland? Instead of the hundreds and thousands of Catholic children expected to come, a few scattered Protestants or Presbyterians only are found in these spacious halls, and upon these the money raised from Catholics is spent, and all the blessings of the system expended. Is this state of things to continue? No; and should it be said that the National System is still working well, because many of the National Schools are under the management of priests, and under the care of nuns; this proves nothing, or rather proves against the system: for if the schools in question are satisfactory, as I do not deny, it is because the practice of the system, in many schools, virtually excludes the mixed principle.

The National Education, therefore, based on the mixed principle, is a failure; it is not, and it ought not to be called National, opposed and resisted as it is and must be by the Catholic faith and Catholic feeling of Ireland. Its vast expenditure is a waste and misapplication of the public money. Let the Government, therefore, establish the denominational system, and they will remove one at least, perhaps the greatest, cause of discontent, and by granting this reasonable demand of Catholics, Government will strengthen itself in Ireland, and feel itself more powerful to resist violence and revolt. I rejoice that his Eminence, at the head of his distinguished clergy, and at the head of the bishops and clergy of Ireland, has taken up this vital and long-vexed question; and I trust that the Government, listening at last to calm and dignified remonstrance, may come to be convinced that Ireland must be treated as a Catholic nation, united to England by the benefit of good laws rather than chained to it by force; and that our rulers may come to see and understand that the wise government of Ireland does not consist in measures only of repression, in proclaiming counties, in crowding prisons, in multiplying and increasing guards, in arming the police, and in calling out special constables; and that it is not the glory of England, nor the interest of England, nor the security of England, to keep Ireland as she now is, one living mass of discontent, groaning under the double weight of misery and misrule.

The Rev. Dr. Molloy said—The resolution, which has been so eloquently and so practically brought before the meeting by

Father Dixon, contains, first, a statement of principle, that our Catholic children cannot receive an adequate religious education under the mixed system; and, secondly, a demand for a better system of education, and one more in harmony with Catholic teaching. I shall confine myself entirely to the question of principle, for it appears to me plain that if that principle be once fully established and fairly acknowledged, our just demand cannot be long refused. I say, then, that the system of mixed education is at variance with sound Catholic principles: first, on account of what it excludes; secondly, on account of what it must inevitably teach. It excludes what is called the religious element from secular instruction;—that is to say, during the chief part of every day, and therefore during the chief part of the whole educational career of our Catholic people, it is the strict duty of the teacher to abstain scrupulously from every religious topic, from every word or act that might suggest to his pupils the idea of God, or of the unseen world. This is the system in its purity and integrity. The card of *secular instruction* is hung up, and thenceforth religion is proscribed, every sanctifying influence is shut out, every holy thought must be repressed, lest it should break forth in word or deed, and, as far as may be, God is banished from the school-rooms. There are many pious practices not exactly commanded by the Catholic Church, but strongly encouraged, and almost universally practised in Catholic schools, to keep alive in mind the sense of God's holy presence;—as, for instance, a passing prayer when the striking of the clock reminds us that we are hastening on to eternity; the image of our crucified Lord as he hung on the cross for the redemption of the world; or the sign of the cross with which the early Christians, as Tertullian tells us, were accustomed to mark and to sanctify even the most ordinary actions and duties of life. But, in the mixed system of education, when secular instruction reigns, no prayer can be uttered, the sign of the cross is under a ban, and even the sacred symbol of our redemption itself, no less than the images of the Blessed Virgin and the Saints, is hurried away from view.

Again, a word of reproof is necessary. The child must be admonished of its duty, and urged to fulfil it; but no religious motive can be hinted at. He may be asked to do it for the sake of the teacher, or through fear of the inspector, or, perhaps, through respect for the Board. But the command of God is not to be spoken of, nor the examples of the Saints to be brought before him, nor that greatest of all examples, the obedience of our Divine Lord to his Blessed Mother. It may be said, perhaps, that I am pressing this matter too far; —that the more general principles of religion, common to us

and Protestants, may be judiciously kept before the children at all times, without any offence, without any danger. I say, No ! Most decidedly not. If the barrier is once broken down, if a Protestant teacher is once allowed to speak to Catholic children on the subject of God, of religion, of the unseen world, we have no longer any security for the faith of our poor. What security can we have against the living words of a living teacher, when the late Archbishop Whately, an able and a far-seeing man, explicitly acknowledges that by two little books, stored with such general principles, he confidently hoped to "undermine the vast fabric of the Irish Roman Catholic Church"?

Again, it is sometimes said that those are, after all, but minute objections, trifling blemishes on a great system ; that if our Catholic children are taught to say their morning and night prayers, and get half an hour's religious instruction every day, they comply at least with the substantial duties of religion, and receive a good secular education besides, and we ought to be content. They comply with the substantial duties of religion : Granted. I am far from admitting this proposition to be true, but I will not quarrel with it just now. I say, in answer to the objection, that children come to school to be *educated*, to be *trained ;* and, since religion is by far the most important concern of man, no scheme of education can be regarded as satisfactory that will not impress upon the pupil's mind a religious tone and character, which shall pervade all his actions, and guide his entire career. Now, this religious tone and character cannot be hammered into the mind, as if it were a machine, by the means of half an hour's daily lecture. Rather we should say, in the words of the poet, "It droppeth as the gentle rain from heaven upon the place beneath," and is then most effectually instilled into the soul, when it steals invisibly and almost insensibly from those innumerable minute influences with which the Catholic Church is wont to surround the tender years of childhood. Let me take an illustration from the air we breathe. It is made up of elements the most minute ; it is unseen, almost unfelt ; the great bulk of men make no account of it ; only philosophers know what it is : and yet it is more to us than food and drink ; take it away for a moment and we die ; let it be vitiated, ever so little, as it is in the confined lanes and courts of a great city, and we grow pale and pine away. And so, too, if a child does not breathe a Catholic atmosphere, it cannot have the rich glow of Catholic health beaming from its soul, or the warm spirit of Catholic faith, and hope, and charity, beating in its heart. I am convinced that the influence of this religious atmosphere is more powerful, more penetrating, than the

influence of religious instruction, strictly so-called, or of controversial teaching, or of learned lectures. Put a Protestant child into the midst of Catholic people, and let him be surrounded by Catholic practices; speak to him not of religion; never hint a word of controversy; and in nine cases out of ten the child, of his own free accord, will become a Catholic. Yet this is the very influence we are forced to banish from our schools by the system of mixed education.

In the next place, I contend that the mixed system is objectionable for what it must of necessity teach. Let me take history. Remember the mixed system is not confined to schools intended for the poor, but it is intended by its advocates to take into its grasp the whole education of the country, primary, intermediate, and university. Now, I ask, is history to be taught under this system? Let this question be answered yes or no. If they say no, then what are we to think of this boasted system of education proferred to a great country like Ireland,—which, with all its faults and all its sorrows, has a name that will be ever revered in the annals of the world,—with the motto inscribed on its schools—"No history taught here"? How can England stand up in the middle of this enlightened nineteenth century, in the face of civilized Europe, and tell the world of this great discovery of a new system for the training of youth, from which God and religion are banished in the first place, and history in the next? If, on the other hand, they answer—"Yes, history is to be taught," then I say, farewell to mixed education. Why, history is the very battle-field of Protestants and Catholics; and that, not ecclesiastical history only, but secular history also. Who plays the most important part in the mediæval annals of Europe? Is it not the Pope and the monks? And must Catholics be content to imbibe their notions about the Popes and the monks of the middle ages from the lips of a Protestant instructor? On the other hand, Protestants would fare still worse if they had to form their judgments of Luther and Cranmer under the guidance of a Catholic teacher. Let it be observed I am not now inquiring who is right and who is wrong; I am simply trying to show that this system of mixed education must be, of necessity, unsatisfactory alike to the sincere Catholic and to the sincere Protestant. To make this still more clear, I will take a case in which the facts are undisputed—say the English Reformation—an event which all must admit to be of the highest importance even in a political and secular point of view. It is simply impossible fairly to treat of the English Reformation without giving offence to Protestant ears. I am not going to ring the changes on an oft-repeated story. I

shall be content to take the graphic summary of a great Protestant historian, who, though an enemy of the Catholic religion, had the magnanimity in this case to confess the truth. Here is what he tells of the origin and establishment of the Reformation in England:—"A king, whose character may be best described by saying that he was despotism itself personified, unprincipled ministers, a rapacious aristocracy, a servile Parliament, such were the instruments by which England was delivered from the yoke of Rome. The work which had been begun by Henry, the murderer of his wives, was continued by Somerset, the murderer of his brother, and completed by Elizabeth, the murderer of her guest." These are simply naked facts; and, if history is to be taught at all, these facts must be taught. Yet, where is the sincere Protestant who would not be unwilling, and most reasonably unwilling, that such facts should be impressed on the tender minds of his children? Would he not apprehend, and rightly apprehend, that the child believing these facts would naturally conclude that the Reformation in England was not the work of God? Therefore, I say, history cannot be taught in the mixed system without abandoning the fundamental principle on which that system is based.

From history I pass to literature, which certainly is not to be excluded from any great scheme of national education. The literature of England is essentially Protestant; nay, it is vehemently anti-Catholic. From Milton to Gibbon, and from Gibbon to Macaulay, all the great names in our literature, the men who have formed the language and developed its powers, and given to it gracefulness and vigour, richness and harmony, all, with a few splendid exceptions, breathe forth, each in his own way, hatred and hostility to the Catholic religion. And their scoffs, and sneers, and calumnies, sad it is to tell it, are set off with that exquisite beauty of diction, and that majestic sweep of sentence, and that graceful play of fancy, and that abounding fertility of thought, which only incomparable genius can give, and which possess a magic power to seize upon the educated mind, and to lead it captive away. Nevertheless, it is to this very literature, poisoned and vitiated as it is, that our Catholic youth must come if they are to be educated men and scholars as we wish them to be; it is here they must learn the English language, if they are to learn it at all. Surely, it is a perilous sea on which they have to venture; and it would be madness, indeed, to leave them without a skilful pilot who may guide their barque in safety amid such terrible dangers. But this pilot is denied, and necessarily denied, in the mixed system.

They may have a pilot, indeed, if they want one, or care for one, when they come back into port; but in the midst of the waves they must shift for themselves—or, worse still, be left, perhaps, at the mercy of a captain whose dearest interest is to lead them on to destruction.

I might go on into other departments of education to illustrate this subject more fully, and show, for instance, how a book apparently so harmless as a dictionary may be made to offend our religious sensibilities or to insinuate religious error. But I have already trespassed too long on the attention of the meeting, and I will now briefly sum up what I have said. I have shown that the system of mixed education is at variance with Catholic principles—first, because it banishes religion from the school-room; and secondly, because, in many essential branches of education, it is utterly impracticable altogether to exclude the religious element; and, consequently, this system is apt to become a convenient instrument for diffusing religious error. Here, then, is my argument:—The Catholic people of Ireland have a strict right to a system of education conformable to the principles of the Catholic religion; but the mixed system is at variance with these principles: and therefore it does not satisfy their just claims. The major of this syllogism I take for granted—it is now, I think, admitted by the statesmen of every party; the minor I have abundantly demonstrated and: therefore I conclude we are justly entitled to call upon Government to give us a system of education different from the mixed system, and one in which our people may enjoy all the blessings of education without any detriment to their faith, and without any offence to their religious sensibilities.

Archdeacon Redmond proposed that a petition embodying the foregoing resolutions be adopted and presented to Parliament, and proceeded to say:—My Lord Cardinal, the object of this petition is most important. It prays for freedom of education, equality in religion, and a fair share of the public funds to enable the Catholics of Ireland to have their schools and colleges in accordance with their own principles, and on the same footing as their Protestant fellow-countrymen of all denominations. Education involves interests of the highest order. It deals with all the faculties and powers of man. It draws them out and develops them as the sculptor draws the beautiful statue from the rough marble block, or as the gardener trains the lowly plant into the height and fulness of the noble tree. It enlightens his intellect, stores his memory with knowledge, teaches his mind how to think, forms his judgment, directs his will, purifies his heart by the influence of religion, and regulates

his manners and behaviour. But without religion, education is productive of the greatest evils. Without religion, the intellect is abused by the pursuit of dangerous and pernicious knowledge the memory is made the depository of wicked recollections ; the mind is corrupted by sinful thoughts and imaginations ; the judgment is confused by erroneous ideas of right and wrong, truth and falsehood ; the will is led astray by false representations; the heart is defiled by setting its affections on sinful objects ; and the manners and behaviour become offensive and degraded by the ebullitions of bad temper and uncontrolled passion. Of all the faculties, the perversion of the heart causes the greatest mischief. The heart is the seat of the affections, and if these be depraved or set upon wrong objects, or excessively indulged, they are sure to vitiate all the rest. As long as Solomon's heart was right with God, what a glorious spectacle he was to the whole world ! He was full of zeal for God's honour and glory, and his people came far and near to be instructed by his knowledge, and to be guided by his wisdom ; but when he set his heart upon creatures and turned it from God, what a miserable spectacle he became ! His glorious intellect was darkened by the fumes of evil passion ascending from his unclean heart, his will was utterly depraved ; and he so far forgot the God who made him, and who lavished upon him the most precious gifts, that he bowed down before the stick and the stone in idolatrous worship, and plunged into the most shameful excesses. Voltaire was possessed of a most acute intellect. He was a poet and satirist of great power, and might have done a great deal of good if he exercised those talents in a proper manner ; but his heart was depraved and uninfluenced by religion, and he waged a satanic warfare against Christ and his holy faith.

All this shows how necessary religion is in the great work of education. Without religion, education makes man a moral monster, destroys the balance of his faculties, puffs him up with the pride of his knowledge, and assimilates him to Lucifer himself. God demands the heart, whole and entire, for himself; Christ declares that from the heart all good and evil come ; and the Holy Ghost says : " Train up a child in the way he should go, and he will not depart from it in his old age." This training should begin with the dawn of reason, should grow with its growth, and strengthen with its strength. The child should be brought up in the love and fear of God, and instructed in the knowledge of its duties to God, to its neighbour, and to itself. The training should be so continuous as to become second nature, and to enable the child to perform its moral and religious duties with facility and exactness.

No art or profession is acquired without a repetition of acts. Religion is the art of arts and science of sciences; it is the one thing really necessary, and should impregnate all secular instruction with its sweet aroma, and purify it with its precious salt. The body, no matter what care be taken of it, will soon be dissolved and return to its native dust, and therefore, what concerns it is fleeting and transitory; but the soul is indestructible and immortal, and its concerns, therefore, must possess an eternal interest. It is impossible to estimate the value of a soul, unless by the price paid for it, and this we know to be infinite. He who paid it has declared that the soul is so precious that nothing can be given in exchange for it. It would be a sad mistake to make it the principal object of education to enable the child to get on in the world, and to provide for the wants of the body, and to take no heed of the undying spirit, which must either shine as a star in the firmament of heaven, or be flung a firebrand into the abyss for eternity. St. Paul tells us that all our actions, even our meals, should be directed to God's honour and glory, that is, done in the spirit of religion. Lord Byron declared that a child could not get too much of religious teaching and practice; that all its senses should be engaged in it, to guard the heart from corruption, and the mind from infidelity; and this was the reason why he had his natural daughter brought up in the Catholic Faith, as having more religious practice than any other. The Catholic Church can recognize no system of education in which religion is ignored. She has received a divine commission to teach whatever Christ has commanded. She must, therefore, have control over the teachers and over the books on the principle, *qui facit per alium facit per se.* She cannot sanction the model schools or the Queen's Colleges, because, in both, the books, teachers, and professors are taken out of her hands. She therefore requires the denominational system, and claims education for her own children, on her own principles, without any interference with the religious liberty of others. The Catholics of Ireland have spilt their blood as freely as any denomination of their fellow-subjects, in support of the honour, the rights, and the glory of this kingdom; they have paid their fair share of the direct and indirect taxes in support of the State; and, as they share in its burdens, they feel entitled to a share in its benefits. They, therefore, claim, what they are fairly entitled to, freedom of education, and such assistance from the public exchequer as will place them on terms of equality with their Protestant fellow-subjects. Without equality in religion, and freedom of education, the Catholics of Ireland bear the brand of a degrading inferiority, and are slaves in their native land.

The following petition to Parliament was unanimously adopted :—

That your Petitioners are the pastors and the guardians of the spiritual interests of the Roman Catholics of the city of Dublin, of the county of Dublin, of a great portion of the counties of Kildare and of Wicklow, and of part of the counties of Wexford, Carlow, and Queen's County.

That, in the conscientious conviction of your Petitioners and their flocks, Education is most closely connected with their spiritual interests, for they believe that Education, to be a source of blessings, must be animated and controlled by Religion ; whilst, separated from Religion, it is productive of innumerable evils to individuals and society : your Petitioners, therefore, as ministers of Religion, are entitled to speak with authority, whilst they lay before your Honourable House the many Educational grievances to which Roman Catholics are subjected.

That the present Educational disadvantages of Catholics are the result of a period of confiscations and penal legislation, endured for conscience sake ; for in past times all the educational establishments founded by their forefathers were suppressed, and laws were enacted prohibiting them to establish schools at home, or to send their children for education to the Continent.

That while the Roman Catholic majority of the Irish people were thus despoiled of their property, both public and private, a great part of that property was transferred to the Protestant University and subsidiary institutions, in whose possession it continues to the present day ; and other great Educational advantages were bestowed on the small fraction of the nation which professed the Established Religion.

That, according to the Report of the Royal Commission of 1853, Trinity College, Dublin, is possessed of 199,573 acres, or one-hundredth part of the whole acreage of Ireland, which, although let at low rents, secure to the institution a very large income and immense influence : that besides the large amount originally expended on the College buildings, extraordinary grants, amounting to nearly £100,000, were voted by the Irish Parliament within one hundred years, for their extension.

That the College has likewise the right of presentation to 21 benefices, chiefly, if not entirely, founded for Catholic purposes by the piety of your Petitioners' Catholic ancestors, some of which livings have an income of over £1,000 a-year.

That all the heads of Trinity College, the provost, vice-provost, scholars on the foundation, etc., are, and must be members of the Established Church, of which the provost, vice-provost, and nearly all the fellows are clergymen.

That schools connected with the Protestant University are scattered over Ireland, forming a network of Protestant Education spread over the land, under the various names of Royal Schools, Endowed Schools, Diocesan Schools, and Erasmus Smith's Schools ; and that these institutions also possess extensive property in lands, granted in part by the Crown.

That these middle-class schools may be considered as intended exclusively for the benefit of members of the Established Church, although a few pupils of other religious denominations are occasionally admitted.

That such schools are subsidiary to the Protestant University ; that a great proportion of the heads and tutors are members of Trinity College ; that all the heads, with two or three exceptions, are clergymen of the Established Church ; and, in fine, that to these institutions are attached 153 Exhibitions for the pupils who pass from their halls to the University of Dublin.

That, in fine, this University continues to be, in most of its essential characteristics, a Protestant institution, about 33 per cent. of its students being even now divinity-students of the Established Church ; its whole

teaching being based upon the Protestant Religion ; the works it publishes being imbued with an anti-Catholic spirit ; and several who entered its halls as Catholics, having, during their University course or afterwards, forsaken the religion of their parents.

Your Petitioners also humbly show that although the Queen's Colleges and the Queen's University were founded twenty years ago with the avowed object of affording to all classes in Ireland higher Education on equal terms, and although over £200,000 have been spent on the buildings, etc., and more than £25,000 is voted by Parliament annually for their support, still they have not only failed, as far as Catholics are concerned, in attaining that object, but have gradually been drifting into Protestantism, for the heads and professors are chiefly Protestants, while of the students more than 75 per cent. are Protestants, and less than 25 per cent. profess the faith of the great majority of the Irish people—a proportion totally inadequate to represent the number of Catholics who, by their social position and preliminary studies, have a right to aspire to a University Education—and even of this small number, many frequent the Queen's Colleges yielding to the pressure of necessity, or tempted by the abundant allurements held out to them.

That your Petitioners are free to confess to your Honourable House that this failure of the Queen's Colleges is but what they fully anticipated, because they are thoroughly cognizant of the religious feelings of their flocks, who share with them the conviction that the mixed system of Education, on which the Queen's Colleges are founded, excluding, as it does, Catholic practices and the full teaching of Catholic truth, and repeatedly condemned by the Holy See and by the Catholic Bishops of Ireland, is a prolific source of religious indifferentism and practical infidelity.

That these Institutions are also rejected by your Petitioners and their flocks, because they are State Colleges, as Irish Catholics will always protest against every effort of the State to force upon them any system of Education restrictive of the authority of their Church, or inimical to the interests of Catholic parents, whose right and duty it is to impart a religious Education to their children.

That the same objections of your Petitioners and their flocks apply to the existing Model and Training Schools of the Board of National Education ; that such of these as are established in Catholic localities, have in general signally failed, some of them having on their rolls only an insignificant number of Catholics in towns or cities where the vastly preponderating majority of the population is Catholic.

That it is the conscientious opinion of your Petitioners and their flocks that it is most important to have children trained from their infancy in the knowledge and practice of their religion ; and as this cannot be adequately done in schools conducted on the mixed principle, it is most important that the denominational principle should be introduced into all primary schools ; and your Petitioners further show that this change might be most easily effected, as a vast number of such schools are practically unmixed, there being, for instance, in this city, only 6 Protestants and 4 Jews in schools containing more than 24,000 Catholics.

Your Petitioners, therefore, humbly pray your Honourable House to effect such changes in existing Educational arrangements in Ireland, as will make public Education, in all its branches, denominational, in the Universities, in intermediate schools, in model and training schools, and in primary schools ; and they further pray that in your wisdom you will place the Roman Catholics of Ireland on a footing of complete equality, as to Educational advantages, with their fellow-countrymen of other religious denominations.

And your Petitioners, as in duty bound, will ever pray.

APPENDIX I.

LETTER OF THE IRISH BISHOPS TO THE RT. HON. EDWARD CARDWELL, M.P., CHIEF-SECRETARY FOR IRELAND, ETC., ETC.

Dublin, 18th March, 1860.

Sir,—Your letter of the 28th November ultimo, conveying the reply of her Majesty's Government to a Memorial of the Roman Catholic Archbishops and Bishops of Ireland, presented in last August through you to his Excellency the Lord Lieutenant, has been for some time the subject of our most serious deliberations. Persuaded that the question which you examine is of vital importance to religion and society, and having considered your suggestions and your statements with the greatest care, we deem it necessary to submit to Government a reply to your letter, giving a further explanation of the course regarding National Education marked out in our Memorial. Whilst writing with a due sense of our great responsibilities, and a full conviction of our right to freedom of education, we shall not depart from the courteous and conciliatory tone in which you have addressed us.

1. *Three principles regarding education admitted by Government.*—Examining your letter, we are happy to find that you lay down, and fully admit, on the part of Government, principles of great importance, in which we cheerfully concur. You distinctly admit, first, the paramount importance of religious education; secondly, the necessity of granting, in the circumstances of this country, separate religious training to the children of each religious denomination; and, thirdly, the right of the Heads of each Church in regard to the religious education of those of their communion.

2. *First principle—paramount importance of religious training.*—The first principle, namely, the paramount importance of the religious education of children, is universally recognized; and the experience of the past, in many countries, shows how the neglect of it has been, not only fatal to spiritual interests, but also detrimental to the peace, harmony, and good order of society.

Treating of this subject, Mr. Portalis, one of the ministers of Napoleon the First, says:—"There is no instruction without education—no proper education without morality and dogma. The professors, because it was unwisely proclaimed that we should never speak of religion in the schools, have taught in the desert. . . . . We must take religion as the basis of education; and if we compare what the instruction of the present day is, with

what it ought to be, we cannot help deploring the lot which awaits and threatens the present and future generations."* In thus expressing his opinion, this experienced politician had in view undoubtedly the recent history of his country, and its fearful revolutions during the preceding thirteen years—revolutions produced by a spirit of infidelity, which had been widely propagated by withdrawing education from the saving influence of religion.

Another celebrated French statesman of the present day, Mons. Guizot, writes in the same sense: "The development of the intellectual faculty, unaccompanied by moral and religious development, becomes a principle of pride, of insubordination, of selfishness, and consequently of danger to society."† Indeed, as knowledge, kept within proper bounds, and moderated by religion, is the source of every blessing; so, left unbridled and unrestrained, not being the "wisdom descending from above," it becomes destructive and pernicious, and, as the Scripture describes it, "earthly, sensual, devilish." (James, iii. 15.)

3. *Opinions of British Statesmen on the necessity and character of religious training.*—Several most eminent British statesmen have expressed their views on this subject with great force and authority. We make some few extracts from their speeches, not with the view of proving what is admitted, or that any doubt can be entertained as to their sentiments, but in order to show what they understood by religious education. We shall see whether they pretend that all secular knowledge, history, moral philosophy, the sciences, as far as they enter into an elementary course, should be taught independently of religion; and whether they would be satisfied with a system exempting children from religious control whilst attending to the lessons of secular knowledge, and interdicting the master all reference to dogmatic truths or religious practices, in his instructions. Their opinions on these matters are decided.

Lord Sandon, in 1847, referring to a speech of Lord John Russell, said that he "was glad to hear the admission that religion was an essential part of everything worthy of the name of education. . . . . The State (through Lord John) admitted that education, in order to be effectual, must be religious. . . . . He thought that religion ought to be interwoven with every part of their education: he meant that the man who taught should be a religious man, and that in his moral teaching he should always keep in view the principles of religion." (Hansard Deb. April 19th, 1847, p. 1063.)

* "Point d'instruction sans education, point d'education sans morale et sans religion. Les professeurs ont enseigné dans le desert, parce qu'on a proclamé imprudemment qu'il ne fallait jamais parler de religion dans les écoles. . . . . Il faut prendre la religion pour base de l'education. Si l'on compare ce qu'est l'instruction avec ce qu'elle devrait être, on ne peut s'empêcher de gèmir sur le sort qui menace les générations presentes et futures."—*Discours au Corps Legislatif*, 1802.

† "Le développment intellectuel tout seul séparé du developement moral et religieux, devient un principe d'orgueil, d'insubordination, d'égoisme, et par consequent de danger pour la societé."

Lord Morpeth, now Lord Lieutenant of Ireland, explaining the reason why separate grants were to be made in England to the schools of each religious society, says (same Debate, p. 1083): "We might have taken a *uniform* scheme, in which we might have prescribed the same course to all alike, without adverting to the existing methods, and without adopting any special method of religious teaching; but I believe in my conscience that such a plan would not have met with the consent either of Parliament or of the people."

Lord Mahon (same Debate, pp. 1197-8) said: "The second question was, whether they would have a scheme of secular education solely, or of secular and religious education combined? For his own part, he considered that if the State should confine itself to secular education, without associating it with religion, it would be doing absolutely worse than nothing."

Lord John Russell (*Ib.* 1221), refuting the project of Mr. Roebuck to separate religion from education, said: "I do not think that the future minister, contemplated by Mr. Roebuck, is likely to have a very long tenure of power, if 'vote for education without religion' should be placed on his banner, and that schools entirely secular should be established by the State."

Sir Robert Peel (*Ib.* 1234) said: "I am for a religious as opposed to a secular education. I do not think that a secular education would be acceptable to the people of this country. I believe, as the noble lord (John Russell) has said: that such an education is only half an education, but with the most important half neglected."

From these passages it clearly results that those distinguished statesmen understood by religious education a system of general instruction having religion for its basis, having religion interwoven with it, and imparted by a master who should instruct by word and example. This is what those statesmen understood by religious education, and not a system excluding the teaching of religion, or restricting it to one hour, prohibiting during the remainder of the day any reference to it and its practices. In accordance with such opinions, a denominational or separate system, blending religion with every sort of instruction, has been sanctioned in England.

4. *Catholic doctrine on the importance of a religious education, and what it implies.*—Our views on this subject are substantially the same as those now stated, and have been frequently laid before the public. Though anxious to promote every branch of science and literature, we repudiate any system in which education is restricted to temporal and material concerns, and to the acquirements of mere worldly knowledge, excluding the all-important interests of immortal souls, of religion, of eternity. Persuaded that the conduct of man in his riper years, and his fate in the world beyond the grave, depend on the religious training of youth,* we continually impress upon children the necessity of serving their Creator from their earliest days, and of directing all their studies and other occupations to the honour and glory of God: we teach

* "A young man," says the Scripture, 'according to his way, even when he is old, he will not depart from it."—Prov. xxii. 6.

them that their greatest and most important business on earth, the end for which they were created, is their own sanctification ; we remind them frequently of the maxim, "What doth it profit a man to gain the whole world, if he lose his own soul?" (Mat. xvi. 26) ; and of the words of the Apostle, "Do all things for the glory of God" (1 Cor. x. 31) ; "all, whatsoever you do in word or in work, do all in the name of the Lord" (Col. iii. 17).

According to our principles, religious education requires, firstly, a knowledge of the doctrines and of the practices of the Catholic Church, differing essentially from those of other communions ; secondly, a proper training in the actual practice of the religious duties prescribed by our Church, such as prayer, making the sign of the cross, self-examination, confession of sins, and obedience and attachment to the Church and her precepts. External religious practices, together with the use of sacred symbols, experience has taught us, deeply impress the youthful mind, and therefore ought not to be excluded from schools.

Besides, religious teaching, to be advantageous, must be given by one having authority, religious himself, and exemplary in life. The teacher, even without intending it, infuses his own spirit and opinions into the minds of his pupils. Hence, as a Pagan or a Jew could not give a religious education to Christians, so a Socinian, or a Unitarian, or a Presbyterian would not be well suited to mould the tender mind to Catholic practices and doctrines.

5. *The paramount importance of religious education not admitted by the National Board.*—Examining the National System as it actually exists, not as you suppose it to be, or as Lord Derby intended it to be—examining it by the test of your first principle, that is, the paramount importance of the religious element, we find it altogether deficient. Firstly, in certain schools, namely, in many belonging to Presbyterians in the North, and in others, Roman Catholic children are not allowed to receive any Catholic education, but are instructed in religious opinions which we condemn. Secondly, in the schools vested in the Board all instruction in history, in philosophy, and even in morality, as far as such things are taught, is withdrawn from religious influences ; and during the greater part of the day Roman Catholic children are obliged to act as if they had no religion. Thirdly, in all schools, not only the sign of the cross, and all external religious practices, but even, by an extraordinary stretch of authority, mental prayer, have been prohibited by the Board. Fourthly, in all, even exclusively Catholic schools, during the hours of secular instruction, the images or pictures of our Blessed Lord, of his Virgin Mother, and of the Saints are prohibited, whilst profane figures are freely admitted. Fifthly, in all schools it is prohibited to set the symbol of Christianity on the building itself.

Is this course calculated to make the rising Catholic generation religious? Is it the harmonious blending, so strongly insisted on by British statesmen, of religion with education? Is religion here made the *aroma scientiarum*, to use the words of Bacon, by which knowledge is sanctified, and preserved from becoming pernicious to the best interests of mankind?

6. *Continual religious training necessary for the class of children attending National Schools.*—And here an important fact is not to be forgotten, that the parents of the pupils of the National Schools are generally poor, and obliged to devote themselves to hard and incessant labour in order to provide scanty means of subsistence for themselves and their families ; so that they have not time, nor are they otherwise well suited, to give proper religious instruction to their children, who must consequently depend on the school for that portion of their early education so necessary to make them good Christians and useful members of society. The children themselves, in great part mere infants, generally under ten or twelve years of age, are destined to earn their bread by the sweat of their brow, and to lead a life of care and sorrow that can be soothed only by the influence of early religious training. Their hopes of success in literature or science or in the race of wealth are generally but slender indeed, but there are noble prospects open to them beyond the grave, which will certainly be realized by the practice of religion. Is it not evident that with them religion should be made the great business of the day? Is it not necessary to give them a continued religious training, in order to supply the deficiencies of their domestic education, and to enable them to bear up against the temptations incident to a life of poverty, and to preserve them from becoming dangerous members of society? Now, what is the case? The pursuit of secular knowledge, in which few can succeed to any extent, is made by the National System their primary occupation ; the study of religion, which holds out certain rewards to all, and is so necessary in every stage of life, is either omitted altogether, as happens in some schools, or made a matter of minor importance, as is the case in all. Thus time is preferred to eternity, and earthly interests to those of the immortal soul.

7. *Religious instruction rendered inefficacious in National Schools by being made the mere task of an hour.*—Another defect in the System is, that religion, in so far as the System provides for it, does not pervade the children's occupation at school, does not run through the school-hours, but is made a thing of some brief moments, and therefore necessarily fails to season and imbue the mind with its wholesome influence ; whereas, were it the presiding spirit of the school, hallowing secular knowledge by its practices, mixed up with all the varied lessons of the day, and gradually infused, the best results would be obtained. Besides, when a Catholic child is warned that during the greater part of the day it is not lawful in the National School to exercise any act of his religion, and when he perceives that the teachers are not allowed to make any reference to so sacred a subject in their common instructions, is it not to be feared that he will begin to suspect that there is something wrong or degrading in his religion, requiring that it should be put under ban, and rendering it unfit to be mentioned or practised in a public school? Such impressions are easily made on the youthful mind, and produce most baneful effects in after life. A doubt or a suspicion excited in the observing mind of a child, may become the fruitful seed of future

scepticism or infidelity. It was wisely said by a pagan, "Maxima debetur puero reverentia."

8. *Patrons allowed by the Board to exclude all religious instruction from National Schools.*—Notwithstanding the admitted paramount importance of religious instruction, the Board has not hesitated to sanction, if such be the wish of the patron, its total exclusion from non-vested schools. In the words of the rule, "It is for the patrons or managers to determine whether ANY, and if any, what religious instruction shall be given in the school-room." (Rules, sec. iv. 9.) Thus, in a Christian country, religion is left to the whim of the patron, whilst the acquirement of human knowledge is strictly enforced.

We are told, indeed, that, in the cases referred to, parents may instruct their children in religion at home, or the pastors may do so in the church. But religious training, treated in this way, is not made paramount in the course of studies; and the system which leaves so important a branch of education to the casual or voluntary intervention of others, is worthy of censure, as calculated to sow in the youthful mind the baneful seeds of indifference to religion, or of contempt for its lessons, which, as even children will observe, are deemed of so little value, that the patron, if he think fit, may banish them altogether from the precincts of the school.

9. *Second principle admitted by Government—separate religious education.*—The second principle referred to in your letter, namely, that of separate religious education for children of different persuasions, seemingly requires no comment. Whilst Unitarians and Socinians deny the Trinity of Persons and the Divinity of Christ, the atonement of the Redeemer, and the eternity of punishment; whilst Presbyterians and Calvinists deny free will, and the divine institution and authority of an Ecclesiastical Hierarchy; whilst the members of the Established Church deny the infallibility of the Church, the spiritual supremacy of the Successor of St. Peter, and the Seven Sacraments, doctrines admitted by Roman Catholics, it would be impossible to carry into operation any scheme of combined religious education. Any such attempt would produce a complete chaos.

10.—*Secular education requires to be associated with religion.*—But whilst it is clear that religious instruction should be given separately, we cannot admit that secular education can be properly imparted without the sanction of religion, and without blending with it the lessons and practices of religion, as we have already observed; and any attempt to separate them is manifestly a dangerous infringement of the first principle of your letter, contrary to the wise maxims of British statesmen, and condemned by the experience of the world.

11.—*The principle of separate religious instruction not adhered to by the Board.*—In the second place, we cannot admit that the principle of separate religious education is practically adhered to by the Board. There is a numerous class of schools under Presbyterians and others, in which Catholic children receive united religious instruction with Protestant children, as we shall show hereafter, and this without violating the existing regulations of the

Commissioners. This practice, as opening the way to proselytism, cannot be denounced in terms too strong.

12.—*Combined religious instruction attempted in the National School books.*—Besides, some books have been introduced into the National Schools purporting to teach formally what is called common Christianity, to the exclusion of the peculiar doctrines of each Christian denomination.* Is not this an attempt to establish a combined system of some sort of vague and undefined religion, excluding all mention of mysteries, of the Trinity, of the Incarnation, of the Divinity of Christ, and of other leading principles of Christianity, which ought to be continually before our minds, and influence all our conduct? The evident tendency of this modern project is to promote indifference to all religion, by preventing children from thoroughly knowing the doctrines and practices of the communion to which they belong, or of any other communion—an indifference than which nothing more pernicious to sound faith, or more demoralizing, can well be conceived.†

* The Scripture Lessons, by a Presbyterian, Rev. Mr. Carlisle, and the "Evidences of Christianity," and other works, by the Most Rev. Dr. Whately, are of this character, and tend to impart to Catholic children sceptical or rationalistic views.

† We here quote, as an illustration of our subject, a passage from a speech of Lord Stanley in 1839:—"He was contending that education was not a thing against and separate from religion, but that religion should be interwoven with all systems of education, controlling and regulating the whole minds, and habits, and principles of the persons receiving instruction. This was a very serious subject, and he was aware that it was one which perhaps could hardly be properly treated and argued upon in a popular assembly; and yet the question so mainly depended upon it—he meant the question how far the Church was justified in the resistance she had given to the plan of her Majesty's Government, for a combined system of education for all classes of persons in one common school, to receive one common course of instruction—that it was impossible not to ask the house and the country to consider whether or not those great points of doctrine and of faith, upon which the several sects of the Christian community conscientiously differed, and which were yet so interwoven with the great scheme of Christianity, and were so important in influencing Christian conduct and Christian motives, that they could not be overlooked by the Church, or blinked by the people, or complimented away for the purpose of conciliating persons of various denominations and opinions—it was impossible (he said) not to ask the house and the country to consider this question in its connexion with points of faith and doctrine: for instance, the great scheme of redemption, the doctrine of justification, the efficacy of infant baptism, the solemn mystery of the holy eucharist—and yet one and all these must be frittered away; one and all of them they must consent to cede at once, and to put aside as matter not to be treated of in public education, if they insisted on adopting the Government scheme of instruction; for, according to that plan, Baptists, Unitarians, Socinians, Lutherans, and Roman Catholics, all those who differed upon any of those points, and differed conscientiously, were to be educated together. Now, if these, or any of these points, were mere points of abstract theory, if they were mere opinions, the solution of which the one way or the other was of no great importance, he should say, in the name of Christian charity, and for the purpose of combining as far as possible all good men, and of softening the animosities of conflicting sects, let us lay aside whatever is not important, let us lay aside whatever is not essential, let us give up all points of curious speculation, and let us be united. But when he saw that these were not such dogmas—

13.—*National School books regarding history, morality, and religion, compiled by Protestants for Catholic use.*—As to the other books in general use in the National Schools, they contain much matter in the nature of combined religious instruction—at once exposing Catholics to danger, and opposed to the principle you lay down. Though destined principally for Catholic use, all those books, in as far as they treat of history, philosophy, morality, and devotional matters—(and all these subjects are introduced into the National School books)—have been compiled by Protestants,* who give an anti-Catholic colouring to their pages, omitting matters considered necessary by us, and insinuating or teaching dangerous errors. For example, where there is question of sin, the Catholic doctrine of contrition and confession is passed over, and something else suggested in its place. Private judgment is referred to, where we appeal to Ecclesiastical authority; and the Scriptures seem to be made the only rule of faith, to the exclusion of the decisions of the Church of God. In the historical chapters there is no mention whatever of the Holy See and its beneficent influence on religion; so that, after going through the whole course, a child would not know that there was a Catholic Church in the world, or that the great majority of the people of Ireland, and of all Christians, were Catholics. Indeed, the history of our country and of its religion is altogether omitted; and the compilers of the National School books appear to have determined to leave the rising Catholic generations in Ireland without any knowledge of their forefathers in the faith, and without any traditions whatsoever of country or of family to console, to cheer, and to excite them to virtue.

It is said that the rules of the National Board do not require that those books should be adopted in every school. In reply we state that this may be true, and yet the books in reality are made obligatory, because, in the first place, no other books purporting to exclude all reference to religious doctrines, and compiled in accordance with the regulation of the Commissioners, can be found; and, in the second place, the low price of books published with assistance from the State, and the fact of a free stock being presented to each school, put the use of any other books out of question.

14. *Published analysis of National School books admits that they contain combined religious instruction.*—The religious character of the books is admitted by the agents of the Board, in an analysis,

when he saw that they were main points of Christian faith and doctrine, believing that by them, mainly, motives must be produced in the hearts of our children, he could not, from any fancied scheme of conciliation, consent to put into the background, he could not consent to treat as matters of indifference, or to put aside those principles which he held to be among the fundamental doctrines of Christianity."

* The books referred to have been compiled by Rev. Mr. Carlisle, Most Rev. Dr. Whately and his family, Mr. Cross, Dr. Sullivan, Mr. Young, Mr. Rintoul, &c.—all Protestants, and generally not Irish. No encouragement was given to native Catholic industry and talent. The hymns are by Watts and Taylor, Methodistical in sentiment and language. The extracts are from Taylor, Blair, Porteus, and other Protestant divines.

of which we give an abstract :—"One of the main objects, in compiling and publishing this series, was to supply, not merely the National Schools, but the public generally, with works moral and religious in their character, without being sectarian. Lessons on *the subject of Religion*, drawn chiefly from the narratives of the Holy Scriptures, are interspersed through *all* the Reading Books, and constitute an interesting epitome of Sacred History. The lessons in the First Book are of a moral kind, with one *decidedly religious;* several in the Second Book communicate important *religious* truths, and are well fitted to create *devout feelings.* The religious sentiments inculcated in the Sequel to the Second Book are of the purest and most elevated kind : the next work following affords a striking example of the successful manner in which some of the *most important truths of Revelation* are blended with secular instruction in the Irish National School Books. The admirable abridgment of the parts of the Old Testament, in the Third Book, is not intended as a substitute for the Bible, but to prepare the pupils for a more extended course of *religious instruction*, and a more beneficial study of the inspired volume. Apart from the Scriptural Lessons continued in the Fourth Book, it contains several poetical pieces of a *devotional* character. The Supplement to the Fourth Book contains a summary of the Old Testament, including a detailed account of the Prophets, and the substance of their prophecies ; besides several *essays on religious subjects by Archbishop Whately and other eminent divines.* The excellent lessons in the Girl's Reading Book form a complete manual of moral and domestic duties, whether in single or married life ; and the Selections from the British Poets are pervaded by a *spirit of genuine piety*, and are well adapted for family reading."* It might have been added, that where so many religious questions were treated, special care was taken to exclude extracts from Catholic writers.

Thus, it is most distinctly admitted that a system of combined religious instruction has been introduced, offering innumerable opportunities of inculcating special doctrinal opinions, in violation of your second principle. Now, can it be held that a Catholic child is safe when patrons of schools noted for their violent declamations against everything Catholic (and there are many of this class) or teachers of their choice, are authorized to explain to him a large portion of the Scripture, and many extracts from Protestant divines, and to form his moral and religious feelings? Would we not be wanting to our duty if we failed to raise our voice against such a danger to Catholic children?

15. *Extracts from Parliamentary Reports, showing the dangers arising from combined religious instruction in the National School books.*—We give here some extracts from Parliamentary Reports, which fully confirm our apprehensions in regard to the use of the National School books. The Rev. Mr. Campbell, of Trinity Church, Belfast, stated—"The Presbyterian mistress of Murphy-street National School informed me that none of the children

* The analysis has been published by Thom, printer to the Board, and is circulated with the National School books, under the eyes of the Commissioners.

refuse to receive the instruction which she gives, which consists of *reading the Bible.* If explanation of the Bible were given, she said there would be refusals; but during the *Lessons* from the *ordinary books* of the Board, opportunities do occur, which can be and are taken advantage of to *instil* religious instruction *without suspicion.* She added, '*Who is to take notice of this?*" The same Rev. Mr. Campbell adds—"The ordinary books contain *religious* instruction of a certain character, and to a certain amount, sufficient to give a teacher an opportunity of branching off from it, and giving peculiar *religious* instruction if so disposed."*

Dean Kennedy, a dignitary of the Protestant Church, says:—"The Roman Catholics, in my National School, receive *combined* religious instruction in the Scripture Lessons, and are examined with the Protestants, who read the same portions of the Authorized Version; and I may mention that an opponent of the Board, and a friend of the Church Education Society, at the half-yearly examination of the children of my school, examined the classes, and, himself, awarded prizes, for the best Scripture answering, to Roman Catholic children. In my schools, there are Roman Catholics receiving a greater amount of Scriptural education, through the medium of the *secular* books of the National Board and the Scripture Lessons, than in any Church Education School that I know. This is my deliberate conviction." And, the Dean adds: "*I think the principles of the National Board are the principles of the Reformation*"†

With such evidence and with such facts before us, may it not be asked what confidence can be placed in, and what security is afforded by, the principle of separate religious education, so flagrantly violated under the sanction of the Board?

16. *Third principle of Government—the right of the Heads of each Church in regard to religious instruction.*—The third principle which we accept from you is that in which the Government, as you inform us, *cheerfully recognize the right which belongs and the duty which attaches to the Heads of the respective Churches in regard to religious instruction.* In these words you not only recognize our rights, but you state our duties—we have a recognized right to give religious instruction to the children of our flock wherever they may be; we are bound to do so in virtue of the office which we hold, as bishops placed by the Holy Ghost to feed the flock committed to our care.

17. *Explanation of Catholic doctrine on the right of giving religious instruction.*—Though our right to give religious instruction is thus fully admitted by Government, it may not be out of place or useless to explain our doctrine on this head in very few words. It is, therefore, to be observed, that the truths of the Roman Catholic Church have not been given to the world after the manner of a philosophical system, with leave and liberty to every one to select any opinions he may think fit to adopt. We believe those truths to be the unchangeable revelations of Heaven, committed to the Roman Catholic Church as a sacred deposit—so sacred,

* Parliamentary Report on National Education, 1854. Q. 8,337-39.
† Parliamentary Report on National Education. Q. 8,010. Q. 8,034.

that no truth can be wilfully impugned or rejected without incurring the greatest guilt.

The right of teaching, interpreting, and propagating these doctrines, we believe, was given by our Divine Redeemer to the Bishops in the person of the Apostles, whose successors they are, when he said: "Go ye and teach all nations, baptizing them, ... teaching them to observe all things whatsoever I have commanded you" (Mat. xxviii. 19, 20). In virtue of this commission, Bishops not only teach the doctrines of the Gospel themselves, but depute other ministers to assist in teaching them; and to carry religious instruction into the bosom of every family, they continually call on parents to provide, from the earliest infancy, for the religious education of their offspring. According to the doctrine of the Catholic Church, even an ordained minister of religion is not allowed to teach or preach without authority from the Bishop; and if he do so, his teaching loses what is sacred in it, and assumes a mere worldly character.

18. *Right of Catholic Bishops to exclude anti-Catholic books and teachers from schools.*—Now, the principle being admitted that the heads of the Roman Catholic Church have a right to give a religious education to the children of their flock, it is a violation of that right to prevent them from doing so; and if any obstacle debar them from exercising that right, they can justly require its removal. Hence their right to prevent the use in schools of books containing anything opposed to their doctrines—hence also their right to require that the teachers and all others connected with schools be such as shall not produce an anti-religious impression on the minds of Roman Catholic children, but rather aid in promoting their religious principles and practices, or, as Lord Sandon, already quoted, expresses it, "that religion being interwoven with every part of the education of children, the man who teaches them shall be a religious man,—in his moral teaching always keeping in view the principles ef religion." Indeed, if the care of children be committed to masters and mistresses of anti-Catholic tendencies—if by word or example they impress anti-Catholic doctrines on their minds—children being swayed by the words and example of those placed over and in continual contact with them, it will be vain to expect that the vigilance of the pastor, generally absent and occupied with various other important duties, can protect their faith from injury.

19. *Catholic doctrine not contrary to the independence of the laity.*—We do not know whether an observation in the eighth parragraph of your letter, where you speak of "*sustaining the just independence of the laity, whether Roman Catholic or Protestant,*" refers to the Catholic maxims just laid down, as if they were subversive of the liberty of others. If it be intended to refer to them, we shall merely say that every Catholic layman, believing the pastors of the Church to have a divinely-constituted authority, not derived either from the Congregation or the State, cheerfully allows their right to teach all revealed doctrines, and to prevent the propagation of error; whilst, on the other side, the pastors, if religious truth be secured from false teaching, leave their flocks full liberty to expatiate as they will in the paths of mere secular

knowledge, and to do as they please in all temporal matters, provided conscience be respected. This doctrine is fully understood by Catholics, among whom the most perfect harmony prevails regarding it. The clergy have made great exertions to establish schools both for the rich and the poor, which are filled (and many more if they could be erected would be filled) with the children of the laity of every class. It is not an indication of jealousy that those whose lot is cast in the humbler walks of life, seek with great anxiety to be admitted into the schools of the Christian Brothers, exclusively religious; and that the wealthier classes cheerfully pay high pensions to have their sons and daughters educated in schools placed altogether under Roman Catholic ecclesiastical authority. Where both parties act so harmoniously, and are fully agreed upon their respective relations, we do not see what necessity there is of sustaining an independence that is not assailed; nor can we conceive how the history of past times could suggest to the Catholics of Ireland an appeal to the State for the maintenance of their educational or religious rights against supposed episcopal encroachments.

20. *Rights of Catholic Bishops recognized in England.*—But to return to our subject, we have sufficiently explained, in what has been said, the Roman Catholic view of the rights of Bishops and Clergy in regard to education. The admission of those rights has been productive of great advantages to society in every country; and to the zeal and energy of the Catholic clergy in exercising them, we must attribute the foundation of innumerable universities, colleges, and schools, and the spread of education among the people. Feelings of gratitude and justice have secured the recognition of such rights, in all the principal kingdoms of the Continent of Europe. They are admitted also in England and the British Colonies. To say nothing of other countries, in England there are separate Roman Catholic Elementary as well as Training and Model Schools receiving aid from Government. The selection of books, the appointment of teachers, and the regulations for giving instruction, are under the direction of the Roman Catholic Bishops. The schools are visited by inspectors selected by the same prelates, and supported by the Government. In case of a dispute regarding teaching, the Bishops decide it on appeal. In fine, the right of the Roman Catholic Church to teach is practically recognized.

21. *The rights of the Heads of the Catholic Church in Ireland ignored by the Board.*—What is our condition in Ireland? You assure us that our rights are "cheerfully recognized by Government," or by the Board acting in their name. But we are forced to declare that we have in vain sought for any recognition of those rights in the present rules and actual administration of the National Commissioners. In the rules published in their 21st Report, the functions of parents and patrons of schools are explained, but we cannot find in them any admission or even mention of ecclesiastical authority, though this authority was originally recognized by Lord Derby.

22. *Catholic pastors told to treat with the Board through their flocks—this proposal examined.*—We have, indeed, been told

that we can act on the schools through the parents of Roman Catholic children, and that their protest against any books, or any form of religious instruction, will be attended to. If this be the recognition of our rights referred to in your letter, we owe it to the faith and docility of our people, not to any act of Government. We must add that this course of action is an inversion of the order of things. According to our doctrines, the pastor is divinely commissioned to feed his flock, and to preserve it from danger; and the Government, through you, professes to acknowledge at least the right, if not the divine commission, to do so as appertaining to the Heads of the Catholic Church. But the Board will not allow us to exercise this function: we cannot treat with you, they say, but we will listen to your flock. The Board condescended to treat with those who know little of the requirements of a religious education, and are incapable of resisting their power, or penetrating their designs; but they will hold no direct and recognized dealings with the Heads of the Catholic Church. We have seen within the last few days a letter, written in this spirit, to a Roman Catholic Bishop, Right Rev. Dr. Furlong, regarding the establishment of a Model School in his own parish of Enniscorthy, pointedly refusing to discuss the question of its necessity with him. From the experience of the past we are obliged to conclude that parental authority is put forward so prominently in the rules of the Board, merely with the view of ignoring and evading all direct ecclesiastical interference; and Archdeacon Stopford, who was engaged in long negotiations with the Commissioners, insinuates that some changes were made in Lord Derby's original rules with the view of securing this result.* In reality the parental authority is set up against pastoral authority, whereas they ought to be concurrent.

23. *No single case can be alleged in which Catholic Episcopal authority is recognized by the National Board.*—So far for the theoretical recognition of episcopal authority. Descending to details, may we not ask in what instance are our rights practically

* Archdeacon Stopford, in a report mentioned hereafter, at p. 100, speaking of pastoral authority, says:—"It appears to have been felt that this part of their charter (*recognition of pastoral authority*) was ill-adapted to effect united education. The Board have never professed to found their rules on such a principle. They have, in fact, skilfully set it aside, and substituted a different principle in its place. About the year 1833 they applied for and obtained official explanations of Lord Stanley's letter. One object of these explanations was to substitute *parental* for *priestly* authority as the principle to which concession was to be made." How easily *parental* authority, when it clashes with Protestant views, can be set aside, the Archdeacon explains in the same report:—"A parent may prohibit his child learning those commandments of God which, at his baptism, he promised to keep. Such a prohibition, even from a parent, we hold to be of no moral obligation whatsoever." Again, in a pamphlet of 1847, he says:—"Were that child persuaded in his own mind, and capable of understanding that he was bound to hear the Word of God, although prohibited by his earthly parents, and were he to present himself in my Scripture class, I would admit him. That would not be an interference with the child's religious persuasions, nor would it involve any violation of my obligation to the parent as defined in my application to the Board."

admitted? Have the Heads of the Catholic Church been consulted about the appointment of Catholic Commissioners and Inspectors who are supposed to be charged with Catholic interests? or on the selection of the books? Though they have repeatedly condemned the Scripture Lessons, and other books, have these been removed from Model Schools? Have they any control whatever over Training and Model Schools where the masters and mistresses are formed, on whose good conduct and religious principles the faith of future generations must so much depend? Have their wishes and their reasons been attended to in regard to the establishment of such schools? Have their remonstrances against the exclusion of religious practices been respected? Have they any right to instruct Catholic children in schools under anti-Catholic patrons? Are they, in a word, simply as Bishops, practically admitted by Government or the Board to do any one thing in the control or administration of the National System? As a negative answer must be given to all those questions, it is evident that the National System is practically opposed to the rights of the Roman Catholic Church, virtually ignoring or destroying a leading principle laid down in your letter. If we are wrong in these views, we should wish to know in what particular cases and by what rules of the Board our rights have been recognized, or in what our rights are considered to consist.

24. *Principles laid down by Lord Derby for the management of the National System.*—Having examined how far the general principles admitted in your letter are respected by the Commissioners, we shall now proceed to matters more specially connected with the National System, and referred to by you.

In the eighth paragraph of your letter, you allude to the principles laid down by the Earl of Derby in the well-known letter addressed to the Duke of Leinster in the year 1831, which principles, you add, "constitute the recognized conditions on which education in Ireland receives assistance from the State." If that document had been acted on, and its instructions carried into effect, we should not have had so many grounds of complaint against the National System. But we regret to say that both the spirit and the letter of it have been departed from by the Commissioners, and always in a way detrimental to Roman Catholic interests, as we shall have frequent opportunities of observing as we proceed.

25. *Right assumed by National Board to change the essential principles of the System.*—Nor can this be a matter of surprise: for the rules of the Board as they now stand afford no protection against innovations and essential changes in the System, but on the contrary sanction them. The fourth leading principle of the Board is: "The Commissioners will not change any fundamental rule without the express permission of his Excellency the Lord Lieutenant."* With that consent, changes in the nature of the System most displeasing to the Catholics of Ireland, and injurious to their religious interests, may be made without ever consulting them, and even before any information regarding such changes can

* Rules published in 1856. Sec. 1, No. 4.

reach them, as the proceedings of the Board are carried on with great secrecy. Indeed, several changes seriously affecting us were made and carried into operation, before anything was known of them by the Catholic body in general.

26. *According to Lord Derby's Letter, the National System should afford separate religious education, and exclude all danger of proselytism.*—Without entering into minute details, let us see what was the essence of the System as laid down by Lord Derby. His letter provides for separate religious education for each religious denomination, and prescribes "that the most scrupulous care should be taken not to interfere with the peculiar tenets of any description of Christian pupils." In conformity with this instruction, the Board, in the first years of their existence, rigorously required that the children of one denomination should not be *allowed* to attend at the religious instructions of those of a different creed. In July, 1833, we find a letter addressed to a Presbyterian, the Rev. Mr. Love, in which the Commissioners state, "That the Holy Scriptures might be read in his school, provided such children only as are DIRECTED by their parents to attend be then ALLOWED to continue in the school, and that all others do then retire; for it is the *essence* of the rules that children whose parents do not *direct* them to be present, should previously retire." Here it is required distinctly, that before children could be *allowed* to attend religious instruction in a creed different from their own, they should be positively directed to do so by their parents.

These same conditions were inculcated in the "resolutions and directions" of the Commissioners in 1833. "Any arrangement for religious instruction that may be made, is to be publicly notified in the schools, in order that those children, and *those only*, may be present at the religious instruction whose parents or guardians APPROVE of their being so."

We give the commentary upon this rule, of a Commissioner, Mr. Blake, in his evidence before Parliament, in 1837. "Our rule," says he, "is perfectly clear upon the subject. . . . . The rule is that such children may attend as are authorized by their parents in doing so; and I consider it particularly necessary that the rules should require the APPROBATION of the parent, for otherwise tricks might be played, perhaps, on both sides; Protestant children might be *induced* to remain in the school whilst Roman Catholic catechism is being taught, so the child is not left to remain, or not, at his discretion; and I should not consider the *absence of dissent* on the parent's part as a sufficient justification. Our object is, in short, both with respect to Protestants and Catholics, to prevent tricking the children of one communion into attendance, when religious instruction is being given to the other." This passage clearly shows that, according to the original Rules of the Board, Roman Catholic children were not to be allowed to attend Protestant religious instruction unless their parents gave positive orders for their attendance, and *vice versa* for Protestant children, for whom the same security was provided.

27. *Essential change in the original constitution of the Board regarding religious instruction.*—Have the principle of Lord Stanley and the original rule of the Board been maintained? Certainly

not. The Presbyterians of the North, unwilling to lose the opportunity of imbuing Catholic children with their opinions, would not consent to exclude them from Presbyterian religious instruction, and, by giving a strong opposition to the rule, practically defeated its object. Besides, Protestant ministers of the Established Church, though anxious to put their schools in connexion with the Board, refused to do so until after repeated efforts and lengthened negotiations, described in a pamphlet written by Archdeacon Stopford,* of Meath, they succeeded in obtaining an essential change in the system. The rule, as it now stands, is that "no child be COMPELLED to receive, or to be present at any religious instruction of which his parents or guardians disapprove." Originally, no child was to be present, or allowed to attend, without the consent or direction of his parent; now, children are allowed, but not compelled, to attend, and the consent of their parents is not required. What a door for proselytism has been thus opened! Poor Catholic children, not as yet acquainted with the value of their faith, may be induced, by the promise of food or clothing, or by the influence of a landlord or employer, to attend Protestant religious instruction, and may be infected with error before they themselves understand the danger, or their parents become aware of it. Now, Sir, if you consider how violent is the spirit of bigotry in the land, and what exertions are made to injure or destroy Catholicity, you cannot be surprised that this facility afforded to proselytism† should have filled our minds with apprehension.

28. *Evil results and dangers arising from the change in the original constitution of the System.*—Facts show that our fears were well-founded. Passing over other testimonies, we shall quote some words from the report of a head inspector of the Board, Mr. Keenan, words mysteriously omitted in the copy of that report presented to Parliament, and only produced on a special motion by Mr. Monsell:—"In all the schools which I visited in Belfast that were taught by Presbyterian teachers, the practice prevailed of giving COMMON religious instruction to all, none of them retiring. Indeed, it is pretty general throughout the counties of Antrim and Londonderry, but I never observed it to prevail in any other part of the country. By this practice religious instruction is *separate* as to time, but not as to the distinction of the denominations whilst religious instruction is going on. I have brought these different practices already under the notice of the Board in my ordinary reports." This testimony proves that Roman Catholic children, in

* The Archdeacon's report to the Bishop of Meath, etc., printed in 1844, contains most interesting details regarding the manner in which changes were brought about in the National System to meet the wishes of the Protestant clergy, and to enable them to *induce* Catholic children to receive their religious instructions. The Archdeacon, in his evidence before a Parliamentary Committee in 1854, says: "The Rule was altered to meet my views."

† When we speak of proselytism, we do not mean that those who are exposed to it always openly change their religion. We speak of the dangers of faith, and of the lessening of faith by attending at anti-Catholic instruction. A person may be inspired with feelings of deep hostility to his Church without wishing to abandon it.

great numbers (it is stated that they amount to tens of thousands), are receiving religious education from non-Catholic masters, and the Board, informed of the practice by an inspector, not only do not protect them from so great a danger, but endeavour to conceal the fact by suppressing the part of the report calling attention to it. We could here accumulate other facts, but the statement of Mr. Keenan is quite sufficient to show how completely Lord Derby's letter is set at nought.

29. *Plan adopted by the Board to prevent these evil results, a mockery and a delusion.*—We are aware, indeed, that since our memorial was presented to the Lord Lieutenant, an order has been issued by the Board* that newly-appointed masters shall be obliged to give notice to the parent when a child attends religious instruction different from his own, even though notice should have been given by the preceding master. This rule supposes the existence of the grievance of which we complain, but the remedy applied is only a mockery and a delusion. No protection is afforded against proselytizing patrons, who can address the children as often as they wish. Then the burden of deciding whether the instruction be fit for Catholics or not, is thrown on persons generally poor and uninstructed, perhaps unable to read the notice sent to them. The interference of the pastor, who is acquainted with the duties and the requirements of Catholic instruction, is not admitted, unless, indeed, he constitute the poor parent as his representative, and explain his objections, through such a medium, to the patron, an expedient fraught with danger to the poor man, whom it may place in a situation of antagonism with his master or landlord, if patron of a school, whilst it ignores the right of the pastor to feed his flock.

30. *The character of National School books in opposition to the original constitution of National System.*—Having treated thus far of a most important change made in the original constitution of the National System, we shall now merely add that the character of the school-books prepared by the Board, which we have already noticed, and the facilities presented by them of tampering with the faith of Catholic children, afford a further proof that the principle of separate religious education, and the necessity of avoiding even the suspicion of proselytism, declared essential to the success of the combined system by Lord Derby, have not been attended to by the Commissioners.

31. *Model and Training Schools, contrary to the original constitution of the National System, calculated to throw the education of the people into hands of Government.*—A further departure from the views and intentions of that nobleman is to be found in the gradual establishment of Training and Model Schools in Dublin and many other towns of Ireland, whilst originally only one Training School was contemplated. We have the most decided objection to the principle on which such schools are established, inasmuch as they tend to throw into the hands of the State, acting through a body of Commissioners, the education of the country, and the formation of the masters and mistresses of the rising generation. When Napoleon I. established the monopolizing univer-

* Dated 30th November, 1859.

sity system in France, he did not conceal the despotic design he entertained of forming, by education, the people according to his own heart, and communicating his own ideas to them. In England, such an assumption was vigorously and successfully opposed by some of the present ministry, and other members of parliament, on the ground that education, so closely connected with religion, does not belong to the functions of the State; and that it would be giving an unconstitutional power to any Government, were it allowed to form masters and pupils according to its own views.

In Ireland we have special reasons for opposing Government interference in the education of Catholic children, for we cannot forget that it has been the traditionary policy of the State to undermine our religion by its systems of public instruction. The Charter Schools, the Kildare-street Schools, and others, were introduced with this view, and vast sums of money were expended in promoting such a project. Can we now be satisfied to see a Government Board take into their hands powers so long directed against us? That great statesman, Edmund Burke, admonishes us, in the strongest terms, against agreeing to such a course: "If you consent," says he, "to . . . put any part of your education under their (the Government) direction or control, then you will have sold your religion for their money. There will be an end, not only to the Catholic religion, but to all religion, all morality, all law, and all order, in that unhappy kingdom" (Ireland).*

32. *Training and other Schools objectionable, as assuming character of Mixed Boarding Schools.*—The Training, Agricultural, and District Model Schools are worthy of special condemnation, inasmuch as they assume the character of Boarding Schools, in which pupils of various religious denominations are permitted to live together without any special provision for religious instruction or practices. The Female Training Schools of this kind are most objectionable, and present a sad contrast to the training institutions in England, in which, under the care of religious ladies, the future mistresses receive an excellent education, and are brought up in the practice of all the virtues that are necessary for their state. The Mixed Boarding System must produce deplorable results: its dangers appeared so evident to the Commissioners of the Endowed Schools, that, whilst differing upon the character of Mixed Day Schools, they were unanimous in condemning any attempt to establish Mixed Boarding Schools. This sort of system has, for the same reason, been exploded by Parliament, in the establishment of juvenile Reformatories. It is to be regretted that a short-sighted policy should endeavour to force upon the Catholics of Ireland, as if to remind them that the spirit of the penal laws is not yet defunct, a system not tolerated in England, and condemned by the wisest statesmen.

33. *Model Schools not managed with a due regard to Catholic interests.*—But it is said that the Model Schools have been managed with the greatest impartiality, and in such a way as to preclude all

* Correspondence of Right Hon. E. Burke, by Lord Fitzwilliam, vol. iv. p. 299.

ground for complaint. We cannot concur in those praises, for is it not the case that in the Infant Model Schools the teachers are frequently persons who cannot fail to give an anti-Catholic bias to their little pupils, even without instructing them in religion? and does not the general aspect of the place, and the variety of religious denominations that are collected together, tend to bewilder poor children, and to render them sceptical or indifferent in doctrinal matters, whilst the prohibition of all reference to the Catholic religion during the time of common instruction, must tend to impress on their tender minds the idea, that there is something in that religion of which they have reason to be ashamed?—an idea which in time will produce dangerous effects, and tend to encourage indifferentism or infidelity.

Then, if we examine the case of the great Model and Training Institution in Marlborough-street, placed immediately under the eyes of the Board, where, above all other places, it was to be expected that the liberality, the justice, and the impartiality of the Commissioners should be displayed, inasmuch as the spirit of the Central Institution was to be diffused through the whole system, and its administration to serve as a model to be imitated, what do we find? In this establishment the Catholic children are about seven times as numerous as the Protestants.* The masters and mistresses under training are, on an average, about 80 Catholics to 21 Protestants of every class. Now, what is the teaching body, where the Catholic majority is so great? It consists, in a great part, of Protestants of every religious denomination,† Unitarian, Presbyterian, and Anglican, giving to this element in teaching a proportion which it certainly does not enjoy in regard to pupils and masters under training. We see in the list of teachers, and others employed in the establishment, persons of every religious persuasion, and even one who is merely designated a *Christian*, as not belonging to any Church. Thus, the school principally destined to train the future master, is not at all calculated to strengthen religious convictions; and the future fate of the Catholic religion in Ireland, as regards the pupils of the Model School and the teachers, is left, in a great part, at the mercy of men, who, perhaps, swear that it is idolatrous, or are ignorant of its tenets. Would any Protestant fellow-subject, if the case were reversed, tolerate this system for a day?

We have been obliged to protest both against the principle on which such schools are established, and the manner of their administration. Yet we find that at the very present moment the Board is erecting new Model Schools in Sligo and Enniscorthy, in

* The return given in the Report of 1852 is 1,311 Catholic children to 168 Protestants of every class—nearly 8 to 1; and 240 Catholic teachers trained to 62 Protestants of every class—or nearly 4 to 1.—Rep. p. xvi.

† We give a list of some of the teachers:—Mr. and Mrs. Young, English Protestants; Mrs. W. Campbell, Miss Campbell, Mrs. Dixon, Miss Croll, Miss Gilmore, Mr. Martin, Mr. Brown, Dr. Sullivan, Mr. Rintoul, &c., all Protestants of the Church of England or Presbyterians. In the list of clerks and inspectors who attend at the central establishment, the variety of religions is equally maintained, with a similar undue proportion of Protestantism.

despite of the reclamations of Catholic Bishops and their flocks, and endeavouring to extend their grasp on education in every part of the country.

34. *Various other changes in the National System detrimental to Catholics.*—Nor is it of Model Schools alone and books that we have to complain : were it necessary, we could easily show that in other matters, also, the administration of the Board, laying aside the character of impartiality prescribed by Lord Derby, has gradually developed anti-Catholic tendencies.

At first, grants were made towards the erection of schools, of which the property lay in parish priests or others. This security has been abolished ; and no grant is now to be made unless the lease of the school be surrendered to the Board.

For some time, if there was only one Catholic child in a school, the rules of the Board required that the Catholic pastor should have liberty to visit that school, to give religious instruction in it to that one child. When, however, the Presbyterians objected to allow priests to enter their schools, the rule regarding religious education was changed ; so that at present no priest can enter a non-vested school to instruct the children of his flock, however numerous they may be, without the previous permission of the patron. Pastoral rights allowed by Lord Derby are not recognized in the actual rules, but parental authority is substituted for them.

For years all Convent Schools were allowed to participate in the public grant—latterly Nuns, if they have several schools in connexion with their Convent, can receive aid only for the school where they reside. In the beginning, Christian Brothers and Monks were permitted to have their schools in connexion with the Board ; of late years this is not allowed (Rule vii. 2).

For a long period children were not prohibited to say short prayers occasionally, and in accordance with the custom of their parents, and of pious families, to make the sign of the cross at certain times ; latterly all this is declared unlawful, and an unholy crusade has been commenced against all religious emblems and practices, in defiance of the traditional usage not only of our own country, but of the whole Christian world, and in opposition to the words of the Apostle : " God forbid that I should glory save in the cross of our Lord Jesus Christ " (Phil. iii. 2).

Without entering into further details, we trust that the statements we have submitted will convince you that we have been compelled by the most cogent reasons to withdraw our confidence from the National System. The principles upon which it was founded have been ignored or violated, and many changes and innovations gradually introduced dangerous and detrimental to Catholic interests and rights ; and thus have been blasted the hopes with which we were inspired after the passing of Catholic Emancipation, and when the system of National Education was first proposed, that the era of intolerance and exclusiveness had passed, and that Catholics were to be treated with justice and a fair regard to their claims.

35. *Objections against the Separate System.*—Having stated our

views in regard to the gradual development of the National System, you will now allow us to examine the arguments urged against separate education, and in favour of a mixed system, which are glanced at in your letter. It is objected against the separate system of education, that it encourages dissensions among the various classes of society, checks the progress of knowled ge, n d interferes with the proper distribution of the public funds.

36. *The Separate System does not promote discord or bad feelings. Such feelings among pupils, or indifferentism to religion, the result of the Mixed System.*—In the ninth paragraph of your letter, you adopt the first assertion, stating that "sectarian (or separate) education is calculated to revive social divisions in Ireland, and to stimulate feelings which it is the object of every just and liberal Government to allay." The natural tendency and the practical operation of the separate and mixed systems do not sustain your views, for we think there is less danger of exciting bad feelings in the country by denominational than by mixed schools. Discordant elements will not coalesce: when Catholic, Protestant, Presbyterian, Unitarian, and Socinian children, are placed together, they cannot be prevented from entering into controversial discussions, and excited religious animosities. Protestant children are often fond of deriding fasting, the sign of the cross, devotion to the Blessed Virgin, and many practices which we consider most sacred. Only a few weeks ago, the Presbyterian boys in a Model School in the North, thought fit to caricature the Catholic doctrines on confession, and to cast ridicule on their companions who approached the tribunal of penance. This is only a natural development of the mixed system, except in cases where religious feeling is merged in indifferentism, and all special religious doctrines are regarded as of no importance.

37. *Mixed System excites jealousy among the pastors of various religious denominations.—Violence of Protestant press and pulpit.*—Besides, mixed schools are calculated to excite jealousy among the pastors of the various denominations. We learn from published placards, from advertisements in newspapers, and from other sources, that many Anglican and Dissenting ministers entertain their flocks on Sundays with denunciations of Catholics, calling us idolaters and followers of Antichrist. In the public religious meetings, held every year, the same language is adopted. The tone of the Protestant press is too well known to require notice. To propagate the opinions put forward in pulpit and press, proselytizing schools are established, and every effort made to attract Catholic children to them. Such things should not surprise us, when we recollect that, in oaths administered by the authority of the State, our doctrines are declared damnable and idolatrous. Now, when ministers such as those we have mentioned, assume the management of National mixed schools, as is frequently the case, must not the Catholic priest be filled with alarm, lest by means of the interpretation of the lessons of religion contained in the school-books and otherwise, the children of his flock may be imbued with error and with prejudices against their own Church? Establish separate schools, and this source of jealousy shall be dried up.

We have referred with sincere regret to the violence of the anti-Catholic pulpit and press, but it is a matter of public notoriety that cannot be concealed. This violence was never carried to a greater extent than within the last few months, during which period, writers in the press and ministers of various sects, whilst eulogizing the National System of education, have not ceased to insult and revile the Heads of the Catholic Church. Indeed, had we been guilty of treason we could not have been more violently denounced than we were by Presbyterian patrons of National Schools, and others, merely because, proclaiming principles laid down by great English statesmen and adopted by Parliament, we demanded Catholic education for Catholic children, leaving it to Protestants to impart a Protestant education to their children.

38. *Catholic teaching tends to promote charity and good will.*—God forbid that imitating, or allowing our clergy to imitate, such conduct, we should engage in so unworthy a strife. Our teaching, being of quite a different character, does not consist in assailing any one. Whether in the school or in the church, we employ ourselves wholly in inculcating the truth and the morality of the Gospel, explaining the sacrifice, the sacraments, the practical duties of the Christian religion, developing and enforcing the whole dispensation of the New Law. In our Catechisms no attacks are made on those who differ from us in religion; nor is any mention of them made, except to inculcate the necessity of charity towards them and all mankind. We teach nothing to check the growth of mutual good will, so desirable for all men, but especially for those of the same country. Our schools have never been conducted in an aggressive spirit, and no one has attempted to fix the charge of proselytism on them.* The children who have been trained in exclusively Catholic schools are good citizens, charitable men, and practical Christians. No argument against separate schools can be deduced from our teaching or our practices, but the contrary.

39. *Results of mixed education in various parts of Ireland, and in our times.—Separate System introduced into England.*—It may further be observed that the theory of mixed education, as lessening religious prejudices and promoting social harmony, derives no confirmation from a reference to the history of those districts where that System most generally prevails. In these, as in Belfast and the northern counties, unhappily violent displays of party spirit and deadly religious feuds are of more frequent occurrence than in any other part of the kingdom.

It is to be added that bigotry and fanaticism, and hatred of

* "It is a remarkable fact, that, since the formation of the Board, notwithstanding that in so many schools *never visited by the Protestant clergyman*, taught by Roman Catholic masters, and placed under the superintendence of the Roman Catholic priests, a few Protestant children are to be found in the midst of a great number of Roman Catholics, only one case has been alleged of an attempt at proselytism on the part of Roman Catholics, and in this solitary instance the charge was proved to have been unfounded." Such is the testimony of a dignitary of the Protestant Church, Dean Hoare, in a pamphlet on National Education, Dublin, 1842, p. 21.

everything Catholic, were never so violent as at present, though the supposed conciliatory influence of mixed education has been acting on the country for nearly thirty years. Where, then, are the boasted effects of mixed education to be seen in Ireland?

Finally, were the separate system so destructive of charity, her Majesty's Government would not have given so fatal a boon to England, reserving the blessings of mixed schools for Ireland.

40. *The Separate System does not prevent the growth of knowledge.* The other assertion, that mixed schools, by stimulating to greater intellectual exertion, have produced more satisfactory results, is completely at variance with facts and conclusions which the late Parliamentary Commission on the subject of Endowed Schools has placed on record. The Commissioners unanimously award, after the most searching investigation, a decided superiority in knowledge and discipline to denominational schools, such as those of the Society of Friends, the Incorporated Protestant Society, and the Christian Brothers.

The testimony of the Commission, in regard to this last class of schools, is entitled, in an eminent degree, to the attention of her Majesty's Government. We shall make a few extracts. Assistant-Commissioner Mr. Crawford says, p. 132, Endowed Schools' Report :—" The *most efficient* schools, in my opinion, are those managed by the community of the Christian Brothers ; and I attribute this efficiency to the excellence of their system, the training of teachers, and their zeal in the cause of education." Dr. M'Blain says :—" I was much impressed with the general aspect presented by these schools, and particularly with *their discipline and order*, combined with the cheerfulness and docility of the pupils. The boys educated in the Christian Brothers Schools' have, in general, attained an *unusual degree* of proficiency in the different branches of learning in which they are instructed.

" The *superiority of those schools* is, doubtless, in a great measure to be ascribed to the extraordinary personal influence exerted by the teachers over the pupils. In addition to this cause, the Christian Brothers, who teach in these schools, appear to have been remarkably well trained for the business of instruction, not merely that they are themselves good scholars, but that they have acquired a great aptitude in the art of teaching, and no ordinary skill in devising the most efficient method for the organization and discipline of these schools."

" With respect to the schools (the Commissioners observe) under the care of the Christian Brothers, we received no complaints. Our Assistant-Commissioners have expressed most favourable opinions as to these schools, in which we *entirely* concur."

With this evidence before us, the fullest which the Government have supplied on the subject, it is vain to tell us of the supposed advantages of mixed education. The contrary is established by testimony, to which neither the country nor the Government can honestly refuse their assent ; yet, with a full knowledge of the excellence of the schools referred to, they are excluded by an express rule of the Board from any participation in the public grants.

As a further illustration of the advantages of the separate system, we give an extract from the evidence of an English Protestant

gentleman, one of the principal officers of the National Board, Mr. Cross, before the Lords' Committee, in 1854, regarding schools taught by religious ladies: "I am persuaded," said he, "that in Conventual Schools the literary instruction is conducted with even greater advantage and success than in many of the ordinary schools. That is caused by the fact that the Convent Schools are conducted by a number of ladies of superior acquirements, whose vow and duty it is, according to their religious order, to attend particularly to the education of the poor, and who take the greatest pains in promoting their literary, moral, and religious instruction. Their schools are models with regard to discipline, neatness, and cleanliness; in fact, the *Conventual Schools present generally the best specimens of education that Ireland can produce.*" Yet, notwithstanding these praises, such excellent schools are in many cases denied any aid by the Board; and where aid is given, a smaller allowance is awarded to Convent Schools than to others, and they are treated as if they were of an inferior character.

41. *The Separate System not opposed to the proper management of the public funds.*—We now come to the third assertion, that we are anxious for the separate system with the view of securing to ourselves the management of the funds allocated to educational purposes. The Protestant Primate of Ireland, Lord G. Beresford, in a published letter, says, that the Catholic Bishops have been asking "for separate grants of money from the State for the purpose of maintaining schools under the exclusive control of the prelates of the two churches;" and the Presbyterians, in their General Assembly, deprecate "the proposal made by the Roman Catholic Hierarchy of a separate grant, under their own IRRESPONSIBLE CONTROL." These charges do not require to be refuted, as our Memorial expressly states that "*we do not entertain any desire to interfere in the remotest degree with the proper management of the public funds, over which the civil government should exercise control.*" But it is necessary to refer to an observation in your letter which seems to bear upon this subject.

In the fourth paragraph you say: "Parliament assigns a considerable sum to the purpose of National Education; and as this sum is drawn from taxes contributed by all, so it is devoted to an object in which all are equally concerned." If these words mean that no funds derived from the public taxes can be applied to schools in which any particular religious tenets are interwoven with education, we cannot admit their accuracy. The maxim contained in them in this sense, is at variance with the example of England and the Colonies, where not only Protestant, but also exclusively Catholic schools, receive aid from the common taxes, without exposing the State to the charge of partiality or injustice. But if the meaning of the passage be, that all those who contribute to the taxes have a right to share in the advantages derived from them, we cordially agree in so fair a principle, admitting that not only Catholics, but all other religious denominations, may advance a claim to participate in the educational grants of the State, the several classes receiving assistance according to their respective wants and their numbers; not for the purpose of establishing proselytizing schools, but to enable them to educate their children

in their own religion. No aid ought to be granted to aggressive or proselytizing schools.

42. *Government interference in education ought to be merely financial and inspectional.*—And here let us ask, would it not be wise of Government to restrict its interference in regard to education to the granting of pecuniary assistance and to financial arrangements, and to inspection as far as it serves to secure the proper expenditure of the public money? A Government consisting of persons professing different and contradictory opinions, and a legislative body to which Jews, Unitarians, Socinians, Baptists, Presbyterians, Anglicans, and Roman Catholics, are equally admitted, cannot safely interfere in forming the mind of youth, a task not to be accomplished without inculcating special religious doctrines. Wherever the State has taken into its hands public education, and especially in mixed countries, its failure has been complete. The example of Prussia is instructive, which, obliged to abandon its schemes of State Education, has begun to restore its legitimate functions to the Church. The State ought to encourage the progress of every branch of knowledge, and can do so effectually by rewarding and promoting merit, by exciting emulation by competitive examinations, and by watching over the legitimate application of the funds alloted to education, without going farther. It ought not to educate, or, assuming the functions of the schoolmaster, to walk in the footsteps of the first French Republic, that declared all children to be the property of the State. The functions of the Government, or of any Government Board, ought to be merely financial and inspectional. If any public Board, especially a mixed one, undertake to give religious and moral lessons to the country, as the National Commissioners have done, it intrudes into the domain of religion, outstepping the boundaries of its own legitimate sphere of action, in opposition to the maxim, "Render to Cæsar the things which are Cæsar's, and to God the things that are God's" (Mat. xxii. 21).

43. *Statements favourable to the National System.—Grants made to Catholics.*—After having explained your objections against denominational schools, you dilate on the advantages of the National System, stating that it was established for the poor, who are generally Catholic, and you refer to the large portion of the grant obtained by schools under Roman Catholic patronage, and to the inestimable advantages enjoyed by Roman Catholics in those schools. There are, you state, 3,683 schools under Roman Catholic patrons, with 481,000 pupils professing the same faith, so that of every hundred children, eighty-four are Catholic, only sixteen Protestant; and of the teachers, eighty in every hundred are Catholic, only twenty Protestant.

We are not indifferent to any good effects produced by National Schools; and, without forgetting our rights to participate in the public grant for education, we are sincerely grateful for any benefits conferred by the State on our flocks. But as in a question so closely connected with faith and morals as education confessedly is, pecuniary and literary considerations alone are not to engross all our attention, you will allow us to make some observations suggested by your statistics.

44. *Grants made to proselytizing schools not mentioned by Government.*—In the first place, we must remark that in your enumeration there is a most serious omission of a large class of schools under Protestant and Presbyterian patrons, in which, in opposition to the original constitution of the system, and to our rights, Catholics receive a combined religious education with children of other persuasions. This class of schools, which is particularly dangerous, is never referred to in your letter.

45. *Many schools called National are Catholic parochial schools.*—In the next place, the National Commissioners or the Government cannot claim credit for the erection of the large number of Catholic schools in connexion with the Board. The non-vested schools under Catholic patrons were generally built without any assistance whatever from the public funds, owing their origin to the charity of the faithful and the zeal of the Roman Catholic clergy. They are, in reality, *Catholic parochial schools*, though the Commissioners require the words *National Schools* to be placed on them, an inscription contrary to truth, if it implies that they are the property of the nation, or that the State had the care or expense of their erection. Many, also, of the vested schools have been built at the expense, in a great part, and by the exertions of the Catholic clergy and laity, though by giving some contributions towards erecting or repairing them, the Board have acquired a legal claim to them.

46. *Reason why Catholic schools and masters receive a large amount of public grant.*—In the third place, if Catholic masters receive so large a proportion of the public grant, whilst we appreciate the advantage, we cannot consider it as a special boon conferred on the Catholic body. It is a consequence of the past and present state of the country, superinduced by former misgovernment and ill-treatment. If Catholic masters receive so large a proportion of the public grant, it is because Catholics constitute the great bulk of those who have need to be educated at the public expense, having been in past times reduced to poverty by confiscation, persecution, and the destructive operation of penal laws. As a matter of necessity, the National Schools, in three provinces, and in a part of Ulster, are almost exclusively Catholic; and except in schools under Protestant or Presbyterian patrons, and in Model Schools, the mixture of pupils is not very considerable. And it is this exclusive character of the National Schools that has prevented them from producing the dangerous results which so generally mark the progress of the mixed system.

47. *Disadvantages of Catholic schools under National Board.*—Now, with such statistics before us, with such an immensely preponderating majority of schools, pupils, and masters on the Catholic side, was it not to be expected that special attention should have been paid to Roman Catholic interests in the administration of a System destined for the education of their children? We regret to state that so clear a principle of equity and sound policy seems to have been overlooked in a matter of so much importance. By a legal fiction, innumerable schools built by Catholics under Catholic patronage, that have never been attended by a Protestant, and in districts where no poor Protestant resides, have been declared to be *mixed* schools, and are treated as if it were necessary

to protect imaginary Protestants against Catholic instruction. During the greater part of the day, every book containing special doctrines of our Church, every mention of our faith, every allusion to the Holy See, and every practice of Catholic piety is strictly prohibited. If the prohibition be violated, the grant is withdrawn; so that in order to participate in the public funds, we are obliged to forego the advantages to be derived from pious practices and from sanctifying knowledge by religion. We have been also obliged to commit, to a great extent, the training of our teachers not only to Irish, but also to English and Scotch Protestants and Presbyterians.

The general constitution of the Board charged with the administration of the System, is just as little conformable to your statistics. The Resident Commissioner and a large majority of the other Commissioners are Protestant; and as the Catholic Commissioners either live at a distance or are engaged in professional duties, the power of the whole body may be said to be placed in Protestant hands.

The majority of the principal officers employed in the Central Institution at Marlborough-street, for regulating the details of business through the country, is Protestant.

The proportion of Catholic to Protestant Inspectors does not at all correspond to the number of Catholic schools and children; and it seems that latterly, in selecting Catholics, a regard is had to those who, having graduated in the Queen's Colleges, may be suspected of not entertaining views favourable to the Clergy or the Church of the great majority of the people.

It appears, therefore, that the statistics referred to by you as a proof of the advantages of the National System, supply us with unanswerable arguments to show that the administration of the System has been carried on in a narrow and illiberal spirit, and without a due regard to the immense preponderance of the Catholic population, especially in the humbler walks of life.

48. *Government Statistics of National Schools show the facility of introducing Separate System in Ireland.*—Those statistics are also very valuable in another point of view, showing as they do the facility with which the separate system can be established. The 3,683 schools under Catholic patrons, and with Catholic masters, and in which the religious instruction is Roman Catholic, require but very slight modifications to make them denominational schools. Introduce the symbols of religion, and allow the use of Catholic books, such as those prepared by the Christian Brothers, which, both in literary and religious merit, are far superior to the National School books, and almost without any further change more than three-fifths of all the schools of Ireland will assume a separate character. Very many vested schools could be converted into Catholic schools with the same facility, whilst others could as readily assume a Protestant or Presbyterian character.

49. *Separate System established in England, though rendered difficult by the varieties of sects.*—In England, where the poorer population is split up into innumerable sects, the introduction of the separate system must have been a work of considerable difficulty. In Ireland the case is very different; in three Provinces

the poorer classes, and those who frequent National Schools, are nearly all Catholics; and in Ulster, though there is a greater mixture of different denominations, many districts have only one prevailing religion. Hence the peculiar circumstances of this country seem well adapted for the introduction of the separate system, which, notwithstanding the difficulties arising from the variety of sects, has been established in England in accordance with the wishes of the people, and the wise maxims of great statesmen, who would approve of no system unless it were blended with religion, and hallowed by its benign influence.

50. *The rejection of the claims of Protestants to special grants for education, no reason why Catholic claims should be rejected.—Privileges of Protestant Clergy in past times.*—In the ninth paragraph of your letter, you inform us that claims in regard to the National System bearing resemblance to ours, had not been listened to by Government; whence you would seem to prepare us for a similar refusal. Presuming you refer to the claims of the Clergy of the Established Church, we cannot but feel surprised that our demands should be confounded or compared with theirs. We are not called on to enter into the merits of their demands, but we must state that our position and our claims are altogether different. They are in the possession of large funds, formerly the property of the Roman Catholic Church, originally intended not only for the support of the Clergy, but also for the education and relief of the poor—funds, much more than sufficient for all the religious, educational, and charitable requirements of a small minority of the population. Besides, in past times, large grants were made by Parliament in favour of Protestants; and Royal Schools, Erasmus Smith's Schools, Charter Schools,* and Kildare-

* In the first Report on Education in Ireland, ordered 3rd June, 1825, we find a long account of the Charter Schools. "The expenditure," says the Report, p. 30, "of the Society (incorporated for promoting Protestant Schools in Ireland) during the ninety years it has been in operation, has been no less than £1,612,138." The Report gives a detailed account of the frightful abuses of the Charter Schools. Page 7, extracts are given from the benevolent Mr. Howard: "The children in general," he stated, "were sickly, pale, and such miserable objects, that they were a disgrace to all society."

The Report adds, p. 30: "From these statements it results that 7,905 children apprenticed cost just a million sterling."—Ib. The Report then states that by a return made in 1814, it resulted that, from 1803 to 1814, there had been apprenticed, 1,583 boys, and 934 girls—"of the former (the boys) 983 were doing well, and 603 had either eloped, or enlisted, or been discharged for bad conduct." The return speaks more favourably of the girls, 205 of whom, however had eloped or turned out ill. "But there is reason to apprehend," continues the Report, "that this return must be considered as far too favourable."

An account of the administration of the Diocesan and other similar schools is found in the same Report of 1825, and in that of the Commissioners of the Endowed Schools.

A Protestant writer, speaking of the Charter Schools, says: "The Charter Schools have filled Ireland with vice and dissension. They have been the fruitful source of enmities, prejudices, and immoralities."—*Views of Ireland*, by J. O'Driscol, Esq. London, 1823. T. ii. p. 335.

The Report of the Endowed Schools' Commission states that the Charter Schools have been successful since the project of converting Catholics through them was abandoned.—Rep., p. 97.

street Society Schools, were endowed for the purpose of propagating their opinions. How far their success or fidelity in managing the funds committed to them in past times, gives them a right to ask for a continuation or an increase of past privileges, is shown by many Parliamentary papers, and especially by the Report and evidence lately published by the Commissioners of the Endowed Schools.

51. *Advantages of Protestant Clergy under present System.*—But even under the National System, Protestant interests have not been forgotten. Is it not the case that a large majority of the Commissioners is Protestant, that the principal professors of the head Training School are of the same religion, that the books relating to history, religion, and morality, have been compiled by Protestants, contain innumerable extracts from Protestant writers, and totally exclude everything Catholic?

52. *Protestant Clergy desire to establish a right to give Protestant instruction to Catholic children.*—But not satisfied with all these advantages, the Protestant clergy insist on obtaining a recognized right to give Protestant instruction to Catholic children, at the expense of the public funds to which Catholics largely contribute. Their object has not been concealed. "I could," says the Right Rev. Dr. Daly, of Cashel and Waterford, in a speech delivered in the presence of the Protestant Primate, and a large assembly of noblemen, on the 20th April, 1843—"I could," said he, "when I was minister of a large populous parish, have educated the Protestants of the parish effectually and scripturally, according to the forms of the Established Church, under the system of the National Board; I could have taken care of the Protestants under that system." One would think that this ought to have been enough; but nothing less than the attendance of the Catholic children at his instructions would satisfy his zeal. Explaining his sentiments, he adds: "But I do trust that nothing, whether favours conferred, or threats held out, will ever induce the Protestant clergy of Ireland to take part in a system which makes it a fundamental principle that notice is to be given to the Roman Catholic children to go away from the Word of the living God." The Church Education Society, in their various Reports, have re-echoed the sentiments of Dr. Daly. Many Presbyterian ministers have latterly spoken in the same sense; and it would be easy to show, by other quotations, that the great end of their aspirations is to seize on the religious education of Catholic children.

53. *Catholic demands for separate education just and reasonable.*—We need not say that our case is quite different. We speak for a population reduced to poverty by confiscation and penal laws. We speak in the name of a Church that has been persecuted and despoiled of all its property, and that has made great sacrifices in promoting public education. Though past injustices ought to be repaired, we ask for neither favours nor privileges; we seek for no monopoly, but for freedom of Catholic education—a freedom which implies a fair participation in the benefits of the State. The principles we act on have been supported by the wisdom and authority of the greatest statesmen, and sanctioned by Parliament for England.

In the name of the same Church we complain that solemn promises have not been maintained, and that our rights, which you, in the name of Government, profess to recognize, have been ignored. We complain that the administration of a system principally designed for a Catholic population is placed in the hands of a body in great part Protestant, and that in the appointment of inspectors and other officers due regard has not been had to the number of Catholic schools and pupils. We complain that the rules of the Board of National Education have gradually undergone changes adverse to Catholics and favourable to Protestants. We complain of the dangers to which our children are exposed in schools where they are *induced* to receive Protestant religious instruction, or can receive no religious instruction at all. We complain that the books, such as we have described them, are unfit for the education of Catholics. We complain that the whole National System has been developed in a narrow-minded, illiberal, and anti-Catholic spirit, and that the Catholics of Ireland, as if to remind them of the degradation of past times, are deprived of many advantages freely granted to all classes in England. In fine, we complain of grievances affecting ourselves and the children of our flocks. But far from seeking to usurp the education of Protestants, we restrict our care to those of our own household, leaving all who differ from us in religion to provide for the instruction of their own children in whatever way they consider most beneficial.

Having now laid before you at considerable length some of our principal objections to the system of National Education, and stated the injustice and grievances of which we have to complain, we trust that when you shall have explained our views to Government, the demands which we have made and now make in the name of the vast Catholic population of Ireland, will be granted in a wise and liberal spirit, and the justice and necessity of our claims for a separate system of Catholic education for Catholic children fully recognized.

We remain, etc.,

+ Paul Cullen.	+ William Keane.
+ Joseph Dixon.	+ Patrick Durcan.
+ Patrick Leahy.	+ Patrick Fallon.
+ Patrick M'Gettigan.	+ John Kilduff.
+ James Browne.	+ David Moriarty.
+ John Ryan.	+ J. P. Leahy.
+ John Cantwell.	+ Dominick O'Brien.
+ Cornelius Denvir.	+ James Walshe.
+ William Delany.	+ Laurence Gillooly.
+ John Derry.	+ Daniel M'Gettigan.
+ Thomas Feeny.	+ Thomas Furlong.
+ Charles M'Nally.	+ John Mac Evily.
+ Edward Walshe.	+ Michael O'Hea.
+ Francis Kelly.	+ Michael Flannery.

APPENDIX II.

RESOLUTIONS

Adopted by the Catholic Archbishops and Bishops of Ireland, at a General Meeting held in Dublin on the 1st, 2nd, and 3rd October, 1867.

§ I.—*On the Disendowment of the Protestant Church Establishment and the Application of its Revenues.*

The Archbishops and Bishops of Ireland, seeing that the Government and Parliament are preparing to deal by law with the Irish Protestant Church Establishment, deem it their duty to declare—

1. That the Irish Protestant Church Establishment is maintained chiefly, almost exclusively, by property and revenues unjustly alienated from the rightful owner, the Catholic Church of Ireland:—That Irish Catholics cannot cease to feel, as a gross injustice, and as an abiding insult, the continued, even partial maintenance, of that Establishment out of that endowment, or in any other way, at their expense—an Establishment to which, as to their fountain-head, are to be traced the waters of bitterness which poison the relations of life in Ireland, and estrange from one another Protestants and Catholics, who ought to be an united people.

2. That, notwithstanding the rightful claim of the Catholic Church in Ireland to have restored to it the property and revenues of which it was unjustly deprived, the Irish Catholic Bishops hereby reaffirm the subjoined Resolutions of the Bishops assembled in the years 1837, 1841, and 1843:—and, adhering to the letter and spirit of those Resolutions, distinctly declare that they will not accept endowment from the State out of the property and revenues now held by the Protestant Establishment, nor any State endowment whatever.

The following are the Resolutions referred to:—

Resolved—"That alarmed at the report that an attempt is likely to be made, during the approaching session of Parliament, to make a State provision for the Roman Catholic Clergy, we deem it an imperative duty not to separate without recording the expression of our strongest reprobation of any such attempt, and of our unalterable determination to resist, by every means in our power, a measure so fraught with mischief to the independence and purity of the Catholic religion in Ireland."—*Resolution of the Irish Bishops in* 1837.

RESOLVED—"That His Grace the Most Rev. Dr. Murray be requested to call a Special General Meeting of the Prelates of all Ireland, in case that he shall have clear proof, or well-grounded apprehension, that the odious and alarming scheme of a State-provision for the Catholic Clergy of this portion of the empire be contemplated by the Government, before the next General Meeting."—*Resolution of the Irish Bishops in* 1841.

RESOLVED—"That the preceding Resolutions be now republished, in order to make known to our faithful clergy and people, and to all others concerned, that our firm determination on this subject remains unchanged; and that we unanimously pledge ourselves to resist by every influence we possess every attempt that may be made to make any State-provision for the Catholic Clergy, in whatever shape or form it may be offered.—*Resolution moved by the Most Rev. Dr. Murray, seconded by the Most Rev. Dr. Slattery, and unanimously adopted at a Meeting of the Prelates of Ireland, in Dublin, 15th Nov.*, 1843, *the Most Rev. Dr. M'Hale in the Chair.*

3. That in thus declaring their determination to keep the Church in Ireland free and independent of State control or interference, the Bishops of Ireland are happily in accord with instructions received from the Holy See in the years 1801 and 1805, as well as with the course pursued by the Irish Bishops of that day in conformity with those instructions.

When a project for the endowment of the Catholic clergy by the British Government was proposed at the end of last century, Pope Pius VI. gave the following instructions to the Irish Bishops, through the Secretary of Propaganda:—*

"The Holy Father most earnestly desires, that the Irish clergy, continuing to pursue the praiseworthy line of conduct hitherto followed by them, shall scrupulously abstain from seeking for themselves any temporal advantages; and that, while by word and deed they express their unvarying attachment, gratitude, and submission to the British Government, and give still more sensible proof of their gratitude for these fresh favours offered to them, they shall nevertheless decline to accept them, and thereby give a bright example of that constant disinterestedness which so becomes the apostolic zeal of the ministers of the sanctuary, and which confers so much advantage and honour on the Catholic Religion, by winning for its ministers, in a remarkable degree, that esteem and respect which render them more worthy of the reverence and love of the faithful committed to their spiritual charge.

"These are precisely the sentiments which our Holy Father has commanded the Secretary of Propaganda to communicate to you, Reverend Father, that through you they may be conveyed without delay to the excellent Metropolitans and Bishops of the Kingdom of Ireland."

The same sentiments are repeated, and at much greater length, in another letter from the Secretary of Propaganda, dated 25th September, 1805.†

4. That the Bishops are confident that the Catholics of Ireland will receive with joy this repudiation of a State endowment for the Irish Church, and that they will never cease to give, without any

* Letter of the Secretary of Propaganda, 7th August, 1801. Irish Ecc. Record, Vol. II., p. 54.

† Ibid. pp. 55, 56.

legal compulsion, the support which they have hitherto freely and dutifully accorded to their Clergy and Religious Institutions.

5. That by appropriating the Ecclesiastical property of Ireland for the benefit of the poor, the Legislature would realize one of the purposes for which it was originally destined, and to which it was applied in Catholic times.

---

§ II.—*On National Education.*

1. The assembled Bishops hereby reaffirm the resolutions in reference to Education adopted in a General Meeting, held by the Bishops of Ireland in Dublin, on the 4th and following days of August, 1863, which are as follows :—

(*a*) "That the Bishops of Ireland, assembled in obedience to the instructions of the Sovereign Pontiff, and having their attention particularly directed, by his authority, to the National System of Education, reiterate their condemnation of the principle on which that system is based, namely, the principle of mixed education, as intrinsically unsound and as unsafe in practice, as at variance with the interests of the Catholic religion and dangerous to the faith of their flocks.

(*b*) "They object to the enforcement on the Catholic people of Ireland of a system in which religion is unnaturally separated from secular instruction ; in which the State would substitute its own power for the authority of the Catholic Church in respect to the education of Catholic youth, and by ignoring the pastoral rights of the Catholic clergy, would deprive education of the only adequate security for its religious safety which the Catholic Church can acknowledge.

(*c*) "That no change in the constitution of the body charged with the administration of a mixed system of education, can compensate for its inherent defects, or neutralize its injurious action.

(*d*) "That the constitution of the Model and Training Schools, as has been repeatedly declared by the Bishops of Ireland, evidently conflicts with the principles of the Catholic Church ; that we again condemn them as specially dangerous ; that we again hereby warn our flocks against them ; and we enjoin on our priests to use their best exertions to withdraw children from them, and at the same time to endeavour, to the utmost of their ability, to provide equally good secular education for the youth of their respective parishes ; and that we require a punctual observance of the resolution adopted at the last General Meeting of Irish Bishops—a copy of which we here subjoin, viz. :—

"'*That, convinced of the importance of Catholic teachers being trained only in Catholic Model Schools, we direct that no priest shall, after the first day of next term, send any person to be trained as a teacher, either in the Central or Model School, or in any other Model School, or in any way co-operate with other patrons of National Schools in sending, after that date, teachers to be so trained ; and that no teachers who shall be sent to be trained after that date in any Model School, shall be employed as such by any priest, or with his consent.*'

(*e*) "That we have learned, with the greatest satisfaction, that in the dioceses in which Model Schools were introduced or upheld against the

authority of the respective Bishops, the measures taken to prevent the attendance of Catholic children at them have been most successful; that we congratulate those zealous Bishops on that success, and on the fidelity of their clergy and people.

(*f*) "That the fiction of a mixed attendance of Catholics and Protestants at ordinary National Schools has been so thoroughly exposed in a Parliamentary report, as to render it quite easy for the Government to accede to the legitimate claims of Catholics for the reconstruction of those frequented by Catholic children. Those claims are: That the teachers be Catholics, approved of by the Bishops and Priests severally concerned; that school-books, such as those compiled by the Christian Brothers, or like them in Catholic tone and spirit, be used in those schools; that the use of religious emblems in schools and the arrangement for religious instruction be not interfered with, and that those schools be inspected only by Catholic Inspectors, appointed as in England.

(*g*) "That as it is expedient to have teachers trained to teach, and as such training, being part of a well-regulated system of education, is acknowledged to be justly chargeable on the public educational funds, an adequate portion of that public money is due to the Catholic people of Ireland, for the training of Catholic teachers for Catholic schools receiving aid from the State; and that, as Catholic teachers cannot have recourse with safety to the existing Training Schools, a separate establishment for Catholics, approved of by competent ecclesiastical authority, is necessary, and should be provided at the public expense; or Catholic teachers should be trained and supported at the public expense in existing Catholic Institutions approved of by the Bishops.

(*h*) "That, as it is forbidden by the Bishops to send Catholic teachers to the existing Training Schools, and as it is the duty of Catholic parents, in obedience to the instructions of their pastors, to withdraw their children from existing Model Schools, Catholic Commissioners fail in the respect and obedience due to ecclesiastical authority, if they require Catholic schoolmasters, or induce Catholic pupils to go for training or education to those schools.

(*i*) "That we declare it to be the duty of Catholic Commissioners of National Education to use their utmost endeavours to effect such a fundamental alteration in the system as will allow aid to be granted for schools exclusively and avowedly Catholic, as to teachers, books, and other religious characteristics; and that, failing to effect such change, they ought to withdraw from a position in which they can neither do good nor prevent mischief.

(*j*) "That we caution our priests against accepting building grants, under such conditions as are contained in leases which the National Board has lately prepared, and against concurring in the acceptance of grants on those conditions by others."

2. The Bishops call particular attention to the resolution (*d*) which declares that the constitution of the Model and Training Schools evidently conflicts with the principles of the Catholic Church, and which enjoins on priests to use their best exertions to withdraw children from them, as being specially dangerous. They direct that that resolution be promulgated anew in all parishes from which it may be apprehended that children would go to those schools; and that priests be again instructed, that it is their imperative duty to enforce it to the utmost of their power.